1608/5882.

THE ANSWER OF THE Earl of *Nottingham* TO Mr. *Whiſton*'s Letter to Him, Concerning the *Eternity of the Son of God*, AND *Of the Holy Ghoſt.*

Deut. XXIX. 29.

The ſecret Things belong unto the Lord our God, but thoſe Things which are reveal'd, belong to us, and to our Children for ever.

1 Tim. VI. *v.* 20, 21.

Keep that which is committed to thy Truſt, avoiding prophane and vain Babblings, and Oppoſitions of Science falſly ſo call'd; which ſome profeſſing, have erred concerning the Truth.

The NINTH EDITION.

LONDON:

Printed for EDWARD VALENTINE, at the *Queen's-Head* againſt St. *Dunſtan's* Church, *Fleetſtreet.* 1721.

Price One Shilling.

1608/5882.

SIR,

I *Think I ought to give you ſome Account, why I did not publiſh the following Letter* Sooner, *and why I do it* Now.

When I receiv'd your Letter concerning the Eternity of the Son of God, *and* of the Holy Spirit, *dated* July 10. 1719. *together with your* Letter of Thanks to the Biſhop of *London*, *dated* Jan. 17. $171\frac{8}{9}$. *annext to it: Tho' I thought I was not, at my Years, to learn my Catechiſm; yet my Curioſity led me to read them, knowing your Reputation for Learning: And I own my great Surprize, to find ſo many* Teſtimonies, *and ſome* Texts, *cited by you againſt the Doctrine of the* Trinity, *by which you had been drawn from that Opinion and Faith, which you once profeſs'd; and which now, with the Boldneſs and Authority of an Apoſtle, (like St.* Paul *himſelf in another Caſe) Behold, I ſay unto you, is* "a fatal "Miſtake: *So I reſolv'd to look into your Quotations, and conſider your Texts; and I own alſo, that I was much more ſurpriz'd, to find your* Quotations *liable to ſuch Objections, as you will ſee in the enſuing Letter, which I writ ſoon after yours came to my Hand, with an Expectation of ſeeing you, when you came into this Country, as you us'd to do every Year; and to prepare my ſelf, as well as I was able, for your Aſſaults, and not to enter into an open Paper-War, knowing my own Ignorance and Weakneſs; and that I had not ſufficiently*

Gal. v. 2. *Letter to the Biſhop of* London, p. 18.

prov'd the Armour, *which was neceſſary for an Encounter with ſo great a Champion*, as had defy'd the Armies of the Living God. *But ſince you have been in* Rutland, *both laſt Year and this, and not afforded me your Company here, as formerly you were wont; and that your Letter to me is referr'd to, in a late Tract by your ſelf, as a full Evidence of the Truth of your Doctrine; and that many may take your peremptory Aſſertions upon Truſt, from ſo eminent a Man as your ſelf; and ſince I have had Leiſure to examine your Quotations, and do find that you have perverted the Scriptures, and* abus'd *your Authors by an* untrue *and* unfair *Repreſentation of the Paſſages you cite out of them; I have* now *ventur'd to ſend to the Preſs my Animadverſions, and what has occurr'd to me upon this Subject; that I might not, by my Silence, be thought your Proſelyte: And becauſe it is not enough*

Rom. x. 10. *to* believe with the Heart, *but* with the Mouth Confeſſion is made unto Salvation; *and not* confeſſing *the Lord Jeſus before Men, is next to the* denying *him.*

I do not doubt, but your Zeal will prompt you to a Reply; and therefore allow me to tell you the Method, in which it will be moſt fair in its ſelf, and ſatisfactory to me and others, who ſhall read it.

1. *To ſtate your own Doctrine, and to ſhew that it is* conſiſtent *with* common Senſe, *and with the* other Doctrines *of our Holy Religion; which, I hope, we agree in; ſome of which I have mention'd in my Letter: For, like the Men of* Capua, *who would not deſtroy their Magiſtrates, though they extremely diſlik'd them, becauſe they could not find better to put into their Places; you ſhould not, in an Age, when many ridicule all* reveal'd Religion, *reproach that, which*

P. 38. *is* eſtabliſh'd *among us, as being againſt* " the Light " of Nature and common Senſe ", *till you have freed*

freed your own *Scheme from that Objection, and evidently ſhewn that it is* rational *and* true.

2. To juſtify the Conſtruction, *which you have put upon the Texts, cited by you out of the Scriptures.*

3. Not to load me with a Multitude of new Quotations. *For that is to lead me into a Labyrinth, where a Man ſo little vers'd in the Fathers, as I am, will want a Clue of Thread to bring him out of it; and you cannot expect that I ſhould believe they are true, or that I will take the Pains to examine them; for I may juſtly conclude them to be* falſe, *till you have prov'd thoſe in your Letter, which I have look'd into, to be* truly *and* fairly *ſtated. And ſince* " Thoſe are the " Original Principal Texts and Teſtimonies, " which concern this important Subject;" *'tis in vain to heap up others, which are leſs Authoritative and Cogent. Now whether your Quotations be* true and fair, *is a Matter of Fact, which can ſcarce bear a Diſpute, or may be eaſily decided: And tho' if they were* true and fair, *which I am ſure they are not, it would not follow, that I ought to yield to them, becauſe there may be others, and you your ſelf have mention'd ſeveral, which are* plainer, clearer, *and* ſtronger *Aſſertions of the* Divinity of the Son of God *and* Holy Ghoſt, *than Thoſe which you have produced againſt it: Tet, if theſe be not* true *and* fair, *it will follow, that you ought to* renounce *that Opinion and Doctrine, into which you have been ſo miſled. But, notwithſtanding this Advantage which I have, I dare join Iſſue with you upon this Point of the* Truth *and* Fairneſs *of your Quotations.* P. 24, & 37.

Laſtly, *As you have a Right to examine my Quotations, and the Conſtructions of the Texts cited by me, (as I have done yours;) ſo I ſhall be well pleas'd to ſee your Obſervations; being very ſure that I have not*

wilfully *prevaricated in repreſenting them*; *and therefore may hope I ſhall not want many Excuſes: But if I have committed any Miſtake, I ſhall willingly be corrected*; *for I my ſelf would amend it, if I knew it.*

But I would not have you think, that I am provoking *you to a Reply, with any Intention of Writing any more upon this Subject: For if what I have ſaid in Defence of our moſt Holy Faith be right, there will be no need of it: But if in any Thing I have err'd, 'tis better to rely on the Goodneſs of thoſe in Authority, to whom I humbly ſubmit my ſelf,* to forgive *ſuch Fault, than* to repeat *it, by attempting* to juſtify *it.*

Burley,
Nov. 21. 1720.

SIR,

SIR,

I Was ſurprized to find in the Prints, an Advertiſement of your Letter to me concerning the ETERNITY of the Son of God, and of the Holy Ghoſt, before I had received ſuch Letter from you, or heard of your Intention to write it:

But now I have read it, I muſt thank you for the Juſtice you have done me, in ranking me with thoſe, who will not deny *the Lord that bought them*; and I truſt in him, that nothing ſhall ever remove me from this *Rock of my Salvation*; and I am very ſorry that any in this Age have made him to themſelves *a Rock of Offence.* 2 Pet. ii. 1. Pſal. lxxxix. 26. Rom. ix. 33.

I wiſh I could as well deſerve the Compliment you make me, *p.* 13. and that I and others did *ſhew our Faith by our Works*; then *that worthy Name by which we are called would not be blaſphemed*, at leaſt we ſhould give no Occaſion for it: And tho' I am very far from imputing to you any ſuch Faults, yet if you conſider how many of your Followers have *put away a good Conſcience before they made Shipwreck of their Faith*, and what Tendency your Doctrine has to produce the ſame Effect in others, you may find Reaſon to *change once more* your Opinion, and to conclude, that This, which you now profeſs, was never taught by our Saviour, who *brought Life and Immortality to Light*, and came into the World, and ſent his Apoſtles *to turn Men from Darkneſs to Light, and from the Power of Satan to God.* Jam. ii. 18. Rom. ii. 24. 1 Tim. i. 19. *Letter to Biſhop of* London, *p.* 18. 2 Tim. i. 10. Acts xxvi. 18.

But before I ſay any more of this, or proceed to the Subject of your Letter, I muſt obſerve ſome Paſſages in your Introduction; *viz.*

1. 'That what Mr. Seaton *lately publiſh'd, was writ, as it were, in Vindication of my Proceedings in the Houſe of Lords:* Now I aſſure you, he did not know of my Intention to make P. 2.

that Motion, which I did there; nor did I know that he had any Thoughts of writing on that Subject; nor did I ever see it till it was in Print. I say not this as an Excuse for it; it needs none, and I am well pleas'd with it; and I must add, that how unfortunate soever I have been in falling under the unjust and malicious Censures of the World, I never have employ'd any Advocates to plead my Cause; I committed my Ways to God, and, Thanks be to him, he has brought forth my Righteousness as the Light, even in the Opinion of those, who in their Turns had been my Enemies, and *had laid to my Charge Things that I knew not*. Besides, in this particular Case I needed no Defence; for surely, in a Christian Assembly, 'tis no Fault to be a Christian; and they themselves, who oppos'd the Clause which I offer'd, declar'd their Readiness to subscribe it, and objected only, that it was not proper to the Bill then before the House.

Psal.xxxv. 11.

P. 1. 2. ' *The Clause which, you say, you had a great Hand in prepa-* ' *ring*, was never offer'd to the House; so I had no Opportunity of opposing it, as most certainly I should have done: but indeed I never saw it. Some Lords did in private Discourse tell me, that such a Clause had been put into their Hands from you; and I am unwilling to tell you how they treated it.

P. 1. 3. ' *You stile the Clause which I offer'd, a new* Athanasian *Test* ' *to be laid upon Christians, whereby, with the People call'd* Quakers, ' *they were to profess*, &c.

If you mean that this is a new Test, as being then first to be introduced into our Law, you are much mistaken. For all the Clergy, *&c* who are to subscribe our 39 Articles, do fully and expressly assert the same Doctrine; and all who come to, and communicate with our Church, either do own the same by joining in our Creeds and Litany, or they do most grosly and infamously prevaricate with God and Man.

I will not say, you are also *mistaken* in your Insinuation, that this Test propos'd was taken from the *Quakers*; for I am confident you *know* that it was *impos'd* upon them as the Condition of their Toleration, and very reasonably sure: For when Indulgence was to be granted to Dissenters, 'twas intended only for Christians, and therefore it was necessary to have some Assurance of their Faith; so that it was a very ill-founded Contempt that you cast upon us, as if we had learnt our Creed from Quakers; and I think it is so too, to call it an *Athanasian* Test: For, great and glorious Champion as he was, of the true Primitive Christian Faith; yet if we have no other and greater *Author* of our *Faith* than *Athanasius*, I and all Mankind must agree with you so far, as that he is not a sufficient Ground of our Faith, nor would it have been the *Rock* on which our Saviour *built his Church*.

But

But if, after all, you mean, by *New*, only that the Faith we profeſs, is not what we learnt from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and was alſo profeſs'd by the Primitive Chriſtians: This is the Queſtion between us, and I come now to conſider it, after I have made one Requeſt to you; *viz.*

That you will not think me ſo vain, as to imagine my ſelf capable of managing this great Controverſy as I ought; and that therefore you will not determine it (I will not ſay by the Proofs I ſhall produce, but) by my Weakneſs in urging them; for the beſt Cauſe may ſuffer by an unskilful Advocate. All that I promiſe my ſelf is, that what I ſhall offer will appear more than ſufficient to juſtify me in the Faith which I profeſs; and ſince we are obliged to give a *Reaſon of the Faith and Hope that is in us*, and you have ſingled out and challenged into the Liſts me the moſt unfit of all others, I may in Juſtice demand of you, and all others, into whoſe Hands theſe Papers may come, not to impute to me any proud Conceit of my own Performances in a Subject, which we all agree to be incomprehenſible. I have never yet affected to be an Author, even in Things which I might pretend to be vers'd in, tho' I have been ſufficiently provok'd to it: But in the Cauſe of God, I may ſay, as in the Caſe of Treaſon, every Man is an Officer; and therefore I rely upon the Candor of Mankind, at leaſt to forgive in me, what God will accept, the Offer of a Widow's Mite. 1 Pet. i. 15.

I ſhall now ſtate what I take to be the true Chriſtian Faith, and what, I think, you have declared in your Letter to be yours.

We both agree, that there is but One God, Eternal, Immutable, &c. *But the Church of* England, *and indeed all the Chriſtian Churches in the World, and with them I an unworthy Member, do aſſert and believe, that in the Deity there are Three Perſons neceſſarily exiſting, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, Coeternal and Coequal.*

You aſſert, 'That *the Son is a Creature made by God the Father, by his own Will, when he thought fit*, viz. *a little before the Creation of this World, begotten or born after an ineffable manner; and that the Holy Ghoſt is a Creature too made by the Son.* P. 26, 29. P. 35. P. 17, 12, 35, 36.

And you ſum up all in this peremptory Aſſertion, 'That *the Light of Nature and common Senſe is ſtrong againſt the* Athanaſian *Doctrine; the Teſtimonies for it comparatively few and uncertain, but thoſe againſt it very many and very pregnant.* P. 38.

This I ſhall examine, and hope to defend our Doctrine againſt ſo bold a Charge, and ſhew that your Doctrine is liable to theſe very Objections.

And here I muſt obſerve, that you are ſetting up a new, but a very improper and inadequate Rule, by which we are to determine this Controverſy: For tho' that which *may be known of* Rom. i. 19.

of God, is *manifeſt to us*, yet ſurely the Light of Nature, *Fleſh and Blood*, could never have diſcover'd to us *Chriſt the Son of the Living God*; This *great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, *God manifeſted in the Fleſh*, which, even after what has been reveal'd of it, ſtill ſurpaſſes our Comprehenſion.

Matt. xvi. 17, 18. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

But if the Light of Nature, and even the Revelation, which God made to the *Jews* from Heaven, could not make the *Comers thereunto perfect*, but there needed a Second Diſpenſation by which we are ſanctify'd; are we to be turn'd to theſe *weak and beggarly Rudiments* for our Inſtruction in the Knowledge of the Lord Jeſus, which paſſeth Knowledge; and as to a Rule, by which we are to judge of the Revelation which God in the latter Times has given us, by ſpeaking to us by his *Son*, and neglect the true Light, which *lighteth every Man that cometh into the World?*

Heb. x. 1. Ver. 20. Gal. iv. 9. στοιχεῖα. Eph. iii. 19. Heb. i. 2. John i. 9.

However, if we muſt be fathoming this Abyſs of the infinite Wiſdom of God, methinks thoſe, who attempt it, ſhould frame ſuch a Scheme, as is, at leaſt, conſiſtent with common Senſe, how different ſoever it be from the Revelation of God in the Holy Scriptures; for if even *the Light* (of Nature) *that is in thee be Darkneſs, how great is that Darkneſs!*

Matth. vi. 23.

I ask therefore,

1. If our Saviour be but a Creature, how can Divine Worſhip be paid to him agreeable to the Light of Nature? Or how can we change *the Truth of God into a Lye* (which is the Account the Apoſtle gives of it) agreeably to common Senſe: And this in ſpight of the many expreſs Texts of Scripture, and the firſt Commandment, in doing *Service to one, who by Nature is no God.*

Rom. i. 20. Ver. 25. Gal. iv. 8.

For no Excellency whatſoever, ſhort of the Godhead, can entitle any Perſon to Divine Worſhip; for *God will not give his Glory to another*; and what the Angel ſaid to St. *John*, is no leſs true in this Caſe, *See thou do it not, for I am thy Fellow Servant; worſhip God.* So that if he be a Creature, he ought not to be worſhipp'd; or if he muſt be worſhipp'd, he muſt be God.

Iſa. xlii. 8. Rev. xix. 10.

You may perhaps give me a ſhort Anſwer, *viz.* That you do not think our Saviour Chriſt a *proper* and *direct* Object of Divine Worſhip. Some of your Quotations come very near to it; and you expreſsly ſay, and even boaſt, that you '*never* '*make the Holy Ghoſt the* direct *Object of any Doxology at all.*' The Foundation of which muſt be, becauſe you reckon him to be a Creature; and this Reaſon holds with you in the Caſe of the Son alſo. But I am unwilling to carry my Suſpicion ſo far, becauſe this Worſhip of Chriſt is not only permitted, but commanded even to the Angels; *Let all the Angels of God worſhip him.* And you acknowledge that ſome of the Scripture-Doxologies are directed to '*the Father and the Son jointly*; ſome to '*Jeſus Chriſt only.*

P. 1. Pſal. xcvii. 7. Heb. i. 6. *Letter to the Biſhop of* London, p. 9, 10.

2. Ac-

2. According to the common Senſe and Notion, we have of created Beings, whatever is made may be unmade. Can the Son of God be annihilated? If this be too harſh Blaſphemy to be aſſerted, as ſurely it is, then there is a Creature, (who tho' you ſay, *he is govern'd by God as his God*, yet) is in this reſpect too hard for his Creator, who by giving *all Power in Heaven and in Earth* to the Son, muſt conſequently remain himſelf not omnipotent: Or, if he does, the Son is omnipotent too; and then if the Son be a diſtinct Being, there are Two Omnipotents, which is abſurd and contradictious: For you ſay in your Quotation out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 'The Son cannot be ever 'obſtructed, as being Lord of all. The Addition of, *eſpecially while* 'he miniſters to the Will of his good and heavenly Father, (which moſt certainly he always does, tho' *eſpecially* ſeems to imply that ſometimes he does not ſo) is not given as the Reaſon of this his Irreſiſtibility; but the Foundation of it is, *as being Lord of all*; that is, *God*, and as ſuch he does always do the Will of his Father, for they have but one and the ſame Will. P. 23. Matth. xxviii. 18. P. 16.

But I muſt not let paſs, without obſerving, how unfairly you have tranſlated this Paſſage in *Clemens Alexandrinus*, as will appear by the true rendring of it; *viz.*

(d) *Neither can He* (the Son) *ever be obſtructed by any other, being Lord of all*, and *chiefly, or moſt of all, moſt perfectly miniſtring to the Will of the good and heavenly Father.*

And in the very next Line, he is ſaid to be (e) *begotten without a Beginning*; which fully denotes his intimate Union *with the Father*, and conſequently that *he* will not, *cannot* ever be obſtructed by him; for, as I ſaid, they have one and the ſame Will.

3. In another of the Quotations 'tis ſaid, 'That the Son is de- 'riv'd from the Subſtance of the Father; and yet there is added, 'that he is a made God, created by the Father. How are theſe conſiſtent? For if the Subſtance of the Father be uncreated, whatever is of that Subſtance muſt be ſo too; but to be created, and yet to be of an uncreated Subſtance, a created uncreated is a Contradiction. P. 17.

4. I preſume you do agree, that our Lord Jeſus was a true, proper, and meritorious, expiatory Sacrifice, and made full Satisfaction to the Juſtice of his Father for the Sins of Mankind, according to this new Covenant of Grace. I ask then, How can a Creature (as you aſſert him to be) have ſuch a Degree of Merit, as to deſerve the Pardon of other Men's Sins? Can any

---

(d) ἐϑ' ὑφ ἑτέρᾳ κωλυθείη ποτ' ἂν ὁ πάντων κύριος καὶ μάλιστα ὑπηρετῶν τῷ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ παντοκράτορος θελήματι παῖς.

(e) Ἀνάρχως γεννώμενος.

Crea-

Creature do more than what is his Duty to do? And the greater the Perfections are, with which any Creature is endued, in the ſame Proportion the greater is his Duty too, ſo that he can have no Merit: And it may be truly ſaid of the higheſt created Beings, as our Saviour teaches us to ſay, *that we are unprofitable Servants*, and add nothing to the eſſential Glory of God, who was infinitely happy before there were any created Beings, and needed not the Service of any Creatures.

Luke xvii. 10.

If you will ſay, that Almighty God was pleaſed nevertheleſs to accept this Sacrifice, you may better ſay, that infinite Goodneſs might have pardon'd us without *any* Sacrifice to his Juſtice for our Sins, and with the *Socinians* deny the Merit and Satisfaction of Chriſt; and then, I am afraid, I may ſay, (as St. *Paul* ſays, *if Chriſt be not riſen*) *our Faith is vain, we are yet in our Sins.*

1 Cor. xv. 17.

But again; if he be a Creature, the *Socinians* ſeem to be in the right: For 'tis hard to reconcile to the Juſtice of God the laying upon an innocent Perſon, an only begotten Son, in whom he was well pleas'd, the Sins and the Iniquities of us all, and the Puniſhment of them too; nay, tho' his voluntary Undertaking of this for us, and his coming into the World for this Purpoſe, may, in ſome Sort, anſwer the Obiection to the Juſtice of God, yet it may be too great a Preſumption in a Creature, to offer himſelf as a Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God againſt us Sinners, becauſe it implies ſuch an Opinion of his own Merit, as would not become a Creature, who (as I ſaid before) can have none.

P. 35. 5. By your Quotation out of *Irenæus* you agree, that *Gen.* i. 26. *Let us make Man after our Image*, was ſpoken to the Son and Holy Ghoſt; which is one of the Texts which have been urg'd for the Proof of the Trinity: But if the Son be a Creature, and the Holy Ghoſt the Creature of that Creature, how ſtrange would it be, and unbecoming the Majeſty of the Mighty God, (who *hath ſpoken and called the World from the riſing of the Sun unto the going down thereof*) *to take Counſel*, as you expreſs it out of *Hermas*, of his Creatures, in the glorious Work of the Creation; which was a full Evidence to the Heathen of *his eternal Power and Godhead. Who hath been his Counſellor*, ſaith St. *Paul? Or being his Counſellor, hath taught him*, ſaith *Iſaiah?*

Pſal. l. 1. P. 11. Rom. i. 20. Rom. xi. 34. Iſa. xl. 13.

Somewhere I have read of a Philoſopher, who, reading the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*, was in Admiration of it, ſaying, It was the nobleſt and moſt proper Account, and beſt ſuited to the Majeſty and Omnipotence of the Supreme God; that (to uſe the *Pſalmiſt*'s Expreſſion) could form *the Heavens by his Word, and all the Hoſt of them by the Breath of his Mouth.* Thus much the Light of Nature and common Senſe could teach: And has Revelation extinguiſh'd this Light? No ſure; for

Pſ. xxxiii. 6.

whom they *not knowing worſhipp'd*, this has declar'd to us: We do not doubt but that all Things were made by the *Word*; but then we ſay too, that therefore the *Word was God:* For, *He, that built all Things, is God.* This Doctrine anſwers all Difficulties, and 'tis much eaſier to believe a Myſtery, which has been reveal'd by the Spirit of Truth, tho' it ſurpaſſes our Comprehenſion, than to reconcile to our Underſtanding, common Senſe, and the Light of Nature, how a Creature can be omnipotent, or *be made a God*, or *was made God*, (as you and your Authors, *as You Cite them*, aſſert) by that God, who ſays, *Is there a God beſides me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any.*

ὃν ἀγνοοῦντες. Acts xvii. 23. John i. v. 1, 2. Heb. iii. 4. P. 13, 14, 16, 17 36. Iſa. xliv. 8. xlv. 22.

6. If the Holy Ghoſt be the Creature of Jeſus Chriſt, as you aſſert; and if Jeſus Chriſt took the Manhood into God, as we ſay, or into that excellent Being made by God, as you ſay; for I preſume we both agree he was truly *Man*, and that all together he was upon *Earth One Perſon*; how is it reconcileable to common Senſe, that the Creature ſhould form any Part of him, by whom he himſelf was created? For the Holy Ghoſt overſhadow'd the Bleſſed Virgin, and that *which was conceiv'd in her, was of the Holy Ghoſt.* Did he, who at firſt made Man, and could raiſe his own Body from the Dead, want the Help of his Creature to form a Body for himſelf in the Virgin's Womb? Again it is ſaid, *God giveth not the Spirit by Meaſure to him*; Did he want his own Creature to aſſiſt him in his miraculous Works here on Earth? Could he make him, and yet not have him without the ſpecial Gift of God? Could he ſend him to his Diſciples (as he ſays, *I will ſend him to you*) and could he not take him to himſelf. But the Belief of Three Perſons in the Godhead (tho' the Scriptures mention them as the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier of Mankind) frees us from the inconſiſtent Difficulties of your Scheme, becauſe they concur as one God, in the Creation of the World, and the Redemption of Mankind.

Luk. i. 35. Matt. i. 20. John iii. 34. John xvi. 7.

Theſe Things may be ſufficient to ſhew, how much better and ſafer it is for us not to exerciſe our ſelves in Things *too high* and *wonderful* for us, nor to ſeek Things too *hard for us*, *leaning to our own Underſtanding, leſt we be wiſe in our own Conceits*, and incur the Cenſure, which one Man after God's own Heart, and another the wiſeſt Man, have fix'd upon ſuch bold Attempts.

Pſ. cxxxi. 1. Eccl. iii. 21, &c. Rom. xi. 25. Pſ. cxxxi. 1. Prov. xxvi. 12.

And this will appear to be the more our Duty, by conſidering the Conſequences which ſuch Doctrines have had, and may ſtill have upon the Minds of Men. For,

1. I am confident that the Doctrine of *Arius*, which ſpread it ſelf ſo largely and chiefly in *Aſia* and *Africa*, may be truly ſaid to have laid the Foundation of *Mahometaniſm*, which that Impoſtor built upon it: For when that Heretick *Arius* had aſſerted the Unity of the Godhead in ſuch Terms as to exclude the

the Son and Holy Ghoſt, making our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to be no more than a Creature, which any Prophet is, tho' one be ſuppos'd the older and more excellent Creature of the Two; it became eaſy for *Mahomet* to perſuade the Minds of Men, ſo prepar'd to receive his Doctrine, (which in a great Meaſure agreed with that of *Arius*) and himſelf as a Prophet, who ſhew'd them ſtill *a more excellent Way*: And it was a juſt Judgment from Heaven *to ſend them a ſtrong Deluſion, that they ſhould believe a Lye, becauſe* they received *not the Love of the Truth*; *or rather, when they had* receiv'd it, put from them *the Word of God*, and by ſo doing had *judg'd themſelves unworthy of everlaſting Life.*

1 Theſ. ii. 11, 12.

Acts xiii. 46.

2. It muſt alſo have as ill an Effect upon the *Jews*, by hardening them in their Infidelity and Blaſphemy: For as the Crucifixion of Chriſt was *at firſt a Stumbling-Block to* them, who had heard out of their Law, and expected that their *Meſſiah ſhould abide for ever*; ſo it muſt be no leſs a Stumbling-block to be told, that their Meſſiah is a mere Creature, if they have an Opinion that he is to be the Son of God, God equal to God; as, I ſhall ſhew by and by, was the Notion and Belief of their Forefathers; and therefore, not *This* Doctrine, as you ſay, but *Yours* will appear a ſtrange Doctrine to the *Jews*; and if Chriſt be no more than a Prophet, they will hardly be induced to believe that he was greater than their Father *Abraham*, or than *Moſes*, whoſe Diſciples they are, and who *know that God ſpake to him.*

1 Cor. i. 23.

John xii. 34.

P. 30.

John viii. 53.

John ix. 28, 29.

3. Conſider what Advantage you give to the Scepticks of this Age, who deny all reveal'd Religion: For they will think they have as much Right to the Light of Nature and common Senſe as your ſelf; for this is the moſt equally divided of any Thing in the World, becauſe every Man thinks he has enough of it; tho' that very Thought is a full Proof that he has not ſo. Now very probably you may confirm them, by the Authorities you have ſo confidently cited, in the Disbelief of the Religion into which they were baptized; becauſe all Men are apt to believe thoſe in the Right who favour their own Opinions or Wiſhes; but I cannot think they will be convinced by thoſe Authorities to embrace your Scheme of Religion; and then they will recur to the Sufficiency of their own common Senſe; and I hope I have ſhewn, that your Scheme is not to be ſupported by common Senſe; and I hope to ſhew, that it is not to be ſupported by Scripture neither; which is wreſted by you to a Senſe very different from the plain Meaning of the Texts themſelves, which you quote, and of many other Places both of the Old and New Teſtament, expreſly aſſerting the Doctrine, which St. *Paul* and the Apoſtles ſo preach'd, *and ſo we believe*; being aſſur'd that the World by Wiſdom cannot know God; that is, ſo know as he is reveal'd to us by the

1 Cor. xv. 11.

1 Cor. i. 21.

Goſpel, *not in the Words which Man's Wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt teacheth.* For *the natural Man receiveth not the Things of the Spirit of God, for they are Fooliſhneſs to him; neither can he know them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcern'd.* 1 Cor. ii. 13. Ver. 14.

I come now to your Texts and Teſtimonies, of which I have ſome few Things to obſerve:

1. You ſay; 'These, which you have cited, *are the principal* 'Original Texts and Teſtimonies, *which concern the important Sub-* 'ject before us, viz. *The voluntary Generation and Creation of the* 'Son of God, *and againſt his Coeternity with the Father.* P. 24. P. 29.

And yet you have quoted but Six Texts out of the Bible, and Two of them are out of the *Apocrypha*, which is indeed allow'd by the Papiſts, but not by Proteſtants, as a ſufficient Ground for eſtabliſhing any Article of Faith. But however, theſe and the others I ſhall examine by and by. 6th Aric. of the 39.

2. As for your Teſtimonies; I cannot pretend to ſo much Learning, as to diſcuſs them with you, as I ought. But I am aſtoniſh'd that you have dared to [d] 'appeal *to ſo many great* 'Men of our Church, *as you have named, for the Truth and Fair-* 'neſs of your Quotations and Aſſertions: For I make no Doubt, but I my ſelf ſhall be able to ſhew that they are neither *fair* nor *true.* P. 40.

And when you have made good your Claim to the *Antenicene* Fathers, by confuting what the Reverend Biſhop *Bull* has publiſh'd of their Senſe, and when you or any Man elſe has given a juſt Anſwer to the excellent Tracts writ by Dr. *Waterland*, in Vindication of Chriſt's Divinity; then, and not till then, will it be proper or decent to triumph as you do, 'That 'the Teſtimonies for our Doctrine are few and uncertain; and then 'alſo there will be no need of thoſe very many and pregnant ones, 'which, you ſay, *are againſt it:*' Beſides, ſhould they prove to be ſuch as you have cited in your Letter to me, which it ſeems are the beſt you can produce, they will be like Arrows ſhot up towards Heaven, they will fall upon your own Head, but do your Adverſary no Harm. P. 38.

Among your Teſtimonies, I find Two taken from *Jews*, who ſurely are very improper Evidences againſt the Divinity of our Saviour, tho' they may be very good Witneſſes to prove the Divinity of the *Meſſiah*, when they expreſly aſſert it, or ſay what neceſſarily tends to it, as I hope to ſhew.

But as you ſum up your Evidence, ſo you alſo give me a Summary of your Faith, as before-mention'd; but I am ſurpriz'd to find it deduced from Authors, who in the Places you

---

[d] *Archbiſhop* Wake, *Biſhop* Hooper, *Biſhop* Smalridge, *Biſhop* Potter, *&c.* P. 40.

cite

cite out of them, aſſert Propoſitions *inconſiſtent with*, and *contradictory to* the ſeveral Articles of that Faith which you profeſs: Now either you ought to take all they ſay for true, which, if your Quotations were fair and juſt, is impoſſible; or if you take that Part only which you like beſt, then 'tis not upon their Authority that you do it; for their Authority is as ſtrong for one Part as the other; but you chuſe what ſuits with your Notions, which you had taken up from ſome other Reaſons, perhaps your *Light* of *Nature*, or *your common Senſe*; and the moſt, that thoſe Authorities can ſignify, is to countenance you in your Opinions; and yet they can be but of little Uſe even to this, if they be inconſiſtent with themſelves; as will appear by ſome Inſtances.

1. You will take it ill, if I ſhould not allow that the Teſtimonies you have quoted, did aſſert that the Son of God was a *Creature*, *made*, *begotten* by the *Will* of his *Father*, or *created*; ſo I need not mention them here: And for the preſent, till I come to examine them, let it be granted.

But of theſe very Teſtimonies ſome do likewiſe aſſert,

P. 13. *Him to be God.*

14. *He was a* true *God*, *or* truly *God.*

19. *God produced a Spirit* like *unto* himſelf, *who ſhould be endued with the* Powers *of God the Father.*

36. *The Son alone is honour'd with the* Paternal *Dignity.*

20. *God the Word.*

37. You your ſelf, ſpeaking of the Place in the *Hebrews*, of the *Eternal Spirit*, do ſay, *perhaps this Place belongs to the Divine Nature or Word it ſelf in Chriſt.*

32. And you ſtile him, *our Lord and God Chriſt Jeſus.*

36. And you argue out of *Euſebius*, *That the Holy Ghoſt is not God*, becauſe he did not receive his *Generation from the Father*: The Conſequence of which Argument is, that *Chriſt muſt be God*, becauſe he did receive his *Generation from the Father.*

Now that the Son of God ſhould be *truly* God, the *true* God; that the *Divine Nature*, the very *Paternal* Dignity ſhould be in him; that he ſhould have *all* the *Powers* of God the Father, and be only a *Creature*, is what I cannot poſſibly underſtand or reconcile, but muſt leave it to your common Senſe.

P. 17. *A made God*, as you ſtile him from *Origen*; or an *only begotten*

P. 24. *God*, from *Euſebius*, in the Senſe which you give it, *viz. the ſame as created*, may become the Heathen Mythology and Theogony, tho' the wiſeſt even of them contemned it: And is it to be tranſplanted into Chriſtianity?

What you quote out of *Epiphanius*, of *Origen*'s Opinion, ſhews plainly, that he thought it very abſurd, perhaps impious. ' *For* ſays he, *when* Origen *ſays the Son is a* made *God*, ' *he plainly determines, that he is but a* created *Being*; *and this* ' Epiphanius *juſtly cenſures, by calling it a* bold *Attempt upon* ' *God.*

I do not pretend that all *Origen*'s Opinions can be defended; he was a great *Platoniſt*; and as they were ſome of the firſt who embraced Chriſtianity, ſo they were alſo ſome of the forwardeſt to corrupt the Simplicity of it, by grafting into it ſome of their Notions. But in this Particular before us, tho' *Epiphanius*, who wrote above a Hundred Years after the Death of *Origen*, charges him with this Opinion, yet *Pamphilus*, who liv'd in or near the Time of *Origen*, and wrote an Apology for him, declares *Origen*'s Sentiments of the Trinity as Orthodox, and in Terms as plain, as afterwards the *Nicene* Council and *Athanaſius* himſelf expreſs'd the Doctrine which we now profeſs; and if the Writings of *Origen* were corrupted even in his own Time, as he himſelf complains they were, they might be much more ſo after his Death. And *Pamphilus*, who was himſelf a Martyr, may juſtly be preſum'd to ſtate truly, as well as to know better, what the Opinions of *Origen* were, than *Epiphanius*, for the Reaſon I have mention'd. Beſides, if thoſe Tracts of *Origen*, which, by your Quotations out of them, you acknowledge to be genuine, do furniſh me with Paſſages *plainly* and *clearly* expreſſing the Doctrine of the Trinity; and if your Quotations out of him to ſupport the contrary, do not amount to it, or are not *fairly* and *truly* repreſented by you, as I hope to ſhew; then I may conclude that *Origen*'s Opinion is more truly ſtated by *Pamphilus* than by *Epiphanius*; and that you have very ill ſupported *Epiphanius*'s Charge againſt him.

Epiſt. ad Char. in Alexandria, *annex'd to* Pamphilus's *Apology*, 789.

2. A Second Inſtance of the *Inconſiſtency* of your Quotations, and which indeed is a *Contradiction*, is, that in them it is ſaid;

The Son of God

Was made of a Subſtance begotten, or made by God.	Was deriv'd from the Subſtance of the Father.
P. 12. *He was a Subſtance, begotten by the Divine Power.*	P. 17. *Deriv'd from the Subſtance of the Father.*
P. 12. *A Being, begotten, made, created, becauſe his Subſtance is not any Thing unbegotten.*	P 13. *God begat of himſelf a certain rational Power, which is call'd by the Holy Spirit ſometimes Son, ſometimes God.*

P. 32. *The very Substance of our Saviour was not the unbegotten Substance of the Father, but was it self begotten by the Divine Power.*

P. 33. Dionysius *supposes not only a Difference of the Subsistences of the Father and the Son, but a Diversity of Substance, an Inferiority of Power, and a Difference of Glory.*

P. 35. *The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are Three Substances.*

P. 26. *Mr.* Whiston's *Account of the Notion of the Ancients is, This* Word *was in an ineffable Manner begotten or created out of his (God's) Substance into a real subsisting Person or Being. And,*

P. 19. *Endued with all the Powers of God the Father.* P. 10. Eusebius *says, God the Word was alone, begotten of him* (ἐξ αὐτοῦ, *out of him, as is said before*, P. 36. *out of his Substance*) *by a* Communication *from him that begat him, and he was declared* God of God; (*which are the very Words of the* Nicene *Creed.*) *And,*

P. 16. *The Efflux of the Eternal Light* (*that is, in the Words of the* Nicene *Creed,* Light of Light.)

But I must observe, in your Quotation above-mention'd out of *Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang.* l. 4. c. 15. your Translation of μετοχῇ τοῦ γεννήσαντος, *by a Communication from him that begat*, is not just and proper; for it ought to be render'd, *By a Communion, a Participation or taking Part of him that begat.* So μετέχει is translated, *Heb.* ii. 14. *he took Part*, and so μέτοχος is render'd in several Places of the Scripture; for μετέχω is of the same Signification as κοινωνῶ, *to have in common*; which last Word is us'd in the same Text, *Heb.* ii. 14. in the same Sense as μετέχω is there us'd; and κοινωνία is render'd *Communion*, 1 *Cor.* x. 6. And I find in my *Lexicon*, that μετέχω, *propriè est cum aliquo habere*; and that the *Latins* have no other Word to express it, but only by *participare*, or *participem esse*: So that *Communion, partaking, or taking part of him*, is something more than *a Communication from him.* This last signifies, imparting to another what was not his before: Communion is, *having in common* what *both Partners have an equal Right to.* The Difference therefore is very material; unless you mean that what was communicated from God the Father, was his own Substance, (as you say, *was the Notion of the Antients*) and the Consequence of this I have already shewn to be, that he must be Uncreated; and then you must acknowledge the Words of

The Greek *Word for* Communicare *is* κοινόω *but* κοινωνέω *signifies* Commune aliquid habere. *p.* 26.

the *Nicene* Creed to be true and proper, that he is ὁμοούσιος, *of one Substance with the Father.*

Do not object to me, that I am dividing the Divine Eſſence, and ſo making Two Gods: For, as in the above-mention'd Text, *Heb.* ii. 14. by *taking Part of the ſame*, he had the *whole* human Nature, and was *perfect* Man; ſo as *God*, he had the *whole* Divine Nature, the *Fulneſs* of the Godhead, in him; and was *perfect* God: And as by having the whole human Nature in him, he was not *all* Men, but *one Man*; ſo by having the whole Divine Nature, he was not *all the Perſons*, but *one Perſon* in the Holy Trinity. And this is the Language of *Tertullian*, as alſo of *Euſebius*, *Origen*, &c. (as I ſhall herein after mention) '*Three Perſons, not by Section, or Separation of the Divine* '*Eſſence, but in Rank and Order according to the Divine* 'οἰκονομίαν.

And this is ſuch a Myſtery, that *Euſebius*, ſays, (i) *that no Words can be found ſufficient to expreſs the Generation and Dignity, the Eſſence and Nature of Chriſt.* And *Origen* ſpeaks to the ſame Effect: (k) *There are ſome Things, whoſe Signification no Man can properly explain by any Words of human Language: For,* as he ſays, (l) *God only, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, hath the Knowledge of himſelf.* I have ventur'd to quote this Book of *Origen*, becauſe *Euſebius* has ſaid the ſame; and ſo does the Scripture too: *For no Man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any Man the Father, ſave the Son.* Which Text is frequently apply'd by the Ancient Fathers, to denote the Incomprehenſibility of the Divine Nature of Chriſt; and ſo it is ſaid of the *Word of God*, Rev. xix. 12. *He had a Name written, that none knew but he himſelf.*

Eccl. Hiſt l. 1. c. 2. περὶ ἀρχῶν, l. 4. c. 2. Pamph. Apol. p. 751. Matt. xi. 27.

And therefore I may much more expect from your Juſtice ſuch a Conſtruction of my Expreſſions in this Letter, as is ſuitable to the Faith for which I am pleading.

I proceed to the particular Examination of your Teſtimonies, (thoſe, I mean, which are taken out of ſuch Books as I have in my Library) and ſhall ſhew, that your Quotations are neither fair nor true: and ſhall follow the Order in which you have placed them in your Letter, when I have made ſome further Obſervations upon your Quotation above-mention'd out of *Euſebius*.

Demonſt. Evang. l. 4. c. 15.

(i) Γένος μὲν ὂν ϗ ἀξίας, αὐτῆς τε οὐσίας ϗ τῆς χρισοῦ ϗ φύσεως ὅπως ἄν εἰς ἔκφρασιν αὐτάρκης γένοιτο λόγος.

(k) Sunt quædam quorum ſignificationem propriè nullus omnino poteſt humanæ linguæ ſermonibus explicare.

(l) Solus enim Deus, Pater, Filius, & Spiritus Sanctus ſui ſcientiam tenet.

Which you render, *p.* 20.

God the Word was alone begotten of him by a Communication from him that begat him, who was the Unbegotten, the first and the greater Being: And he was declar'd God of God, and call'd the Christ and the Anointed.

But in the *Greek* it runs thus:

(1) *God the Word having participated of the Divine, to all incommunicable, Paternal Fragrancy; and being alone begotten of him; and by a Participation, or taking Part of him who begat him, who was the Unbegotten and the First, and the Greater, being manifested to be God of God, was call'd Christ, and the Anointed.*

The Difference between these Two Translations is obvious; and what I shall observe upon this Passage, will shew how very unjust and unfair you have been in representing it.

1. You have omitted the first Part of it, tho' it was the proper Introduction to the Conclusion of it; and indeed the *Reason* why the Word of God was call'd Christ and the Anointed, *viz.* because *he was anointed with the Divine, Incommunicable, Paternal Fragancy*; but this did not suit with your Doctrine, being too strong an Assertion of his Divinity; for if he had *all* the *Divine*, the very *Paternal* Attributes of God, *incommunicable to all Creatures*, then surely he is not a *Creature*, for it will be gross Blasphemy to assert it; he must be *God*.

2. I have before observ'd your Translation of μετοχῇ by a Communication; I now add, Why do you translate μετοχῇ τῦ γεννήσαντος by a Communication *from him* that begat? For 1*st*, Grammar will not bear it; and, 2*dly*, Neither will good Sense: For supposing Communication were a proper Signification of μετοχὴ, there must be a Communication of *something*, as well as a Person *from whom* the Communication is made; but in your Translation nothing is said to be communicated, but in *Eusebius* the Communication is *of him* that begat: And this was very proper to what follows it. For,

3. You have left out the word *And*, which should have preceeded, *by a Communication*; and inserted it before, *He was declared God*, that your Reader might think he was begot by a

(1) Τῆς θεϊκῆς καὶ πᾶσιν ἀκοινωνήτου πατεικῆς εὐωδίας μετειληφότα καὶ μόνον ἐξ αὐτῦ γεννηθέντα θεὸν, λόγον, μετοχῇ τε τῦ γεννήσαντος ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀφθάρτου καὶ μείζονος θεὸν ἐν θεῷ ἀποφανθέντα, χριστὸν καὶ ἠλειμμένον ἀπηχήλεσε.

Commu-

Communication from him, of ſome Created Subſtance, as you ſay in your Letter; and that *Euſebius* in this Paſſage, by your quoting it, ſupported that Opinion; yet this is far otherwiſe: For tho' it be true, that he is the only begotten Son of God, becauſe he partakes of him that begat him; yet the Intent of *Euſebius* in this Place, was not to prove that Propoſition, but to give a Reaſon why and how he was God of God, *viz.* by a Participation of God.

And therefore if you would allow *Euſebius* to ſpeak for himſelf, and his own Senſe, it is plainly this: That *God the Word* is the *only begotten* of the *Father*; that he is *truly* God, for he *partakes* of him, and his *Divine Nature and Eſſence*; and becauſe he is anointed with all the *Divine*, *Incommunicable*, *Paternal* Attributes, he is ſtil'd *Chriſt*, and *the anointed*.

And though he that begat, is ſaid to be the *Firſt* and *the Greater*; yet this muſt be underſtood, as others who have us'd the like Expreſſions, have explain'd them, *viz.* *in Rank and Order, not in State and Dignity*; and *Euſebius* in this very Place, goes on and cites the 45th *Pſalm*, ver. 6, 7. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, &c. as St. *Paul* hath applied it, *Heb.* i. and a little after ſtiles him ([m]) *Copartner in the Throne with the God over all.*

What I have to ſay to your Quotation out of *Juſtin*, that Chriſt is the *Firſt-born*, will be more proper when I come to the Text cited by you out of the *Coloſſians*. P. 12.

Your Two firſt Quotations out of his Dialogue with *Trypho* are right; only your Tranſlation of πρὸ αἰώνων, *before the World*, (which is indeed equivalent to the literal rendring, *before the Ages*) will not warrant what you mean by it, as if there were a Time when he was not, as will appear in the Sequel of this Letter, and indeed in this very Paſſage: For when *Trypho* had ſumm'd up *Juſtin*'s Aſſertion, *p.* 267. which he had been proving, *viz.* *That Chriſt being God, præexiſted before all Ages, was begotten and made Man*; he adds, ([n]) *This is not only a* Paradox, *but is alſo* fooliſh. Which ſhews how he underſtood *Juſtin*, *viz.* that he was truly God in the higheſt Senſe; for otherwiſe, a *Jew*, who believ'd that Angels had been often ſent and appeared in human Shape, would never have call'd it a Paradox and Folly to aſſert, that a Creature, tho' never ſo excellent, ſhould come into the World. P. 13.

Your Third Quotation, *Who was God before the World was made*, muſt be readily agreed to, and 'twill by no Means be ſubſervient to your Purpoſe. For, Dia. *p.* 27

([m]) Συνάθρονον τῆ ὄντι πάντων θεῷ.

([n]) Τὸ γὰρ λέγειν σε προυπάρχειν θεὸν ὄντα πρὸ αἰώνων τοῦτον τὸν χριστὸν, εἶτα καὶ γυναικὶ μιγῆναι ἀνθρωπίνῃ, γεγόμενον ἐπομένως καὶ ὅτι ἐκ ἀνθρώπου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, ὃ μόνον παράδοξον δοκεῖ μοι εἶναι ἀλλὰ καὶ μωρόν.

Juſtin was proving, that One of the Three who appear'd to *Abraham*, and was call'd and written in Scripture to be God, and was God before the World was made, was another Perſon different from him who made all Things: I mean, ſays he, in Τρομμ. *Number* not in *Will*. And then he proceeds to ſeveral ſuch other Proofs of this Doctrine out of the Scriptures.

[Here I muſt not let ſlip this Occaſion to take notice of your very confident Aſſertion, P. 25. '*That the Antient Chriſtians, ever allow'd, that the Expreſſions in the Old Teſtament, whenever there was a viſible Perſon appear'd, were ſpoken by the Son, as the Image of the Inviſible God, or as repreſenting and perſonating his Father, as his Miniſter and Vicegerent; and that they never look'd upon them as true in the higheſt Senſe of the Son.*' The contrary is moſt plain by the Inſtances in *Juſtin*, who draws the ſame Conſequences from them, as do now the Moderns. *On the New Teſtament*, p. 820. And Dr. *Hammond* ſays, *That 'twas the general Opinion of the Antient Fathers of the Church, that he, who appear'd of old to the Patriarchs, was not the Firſt, but the Second Perſon in the Trinity; and that theſe his Appearances were* Præludia Incarnationis. Adv. Judæos, c. 9. p. 142. (g) And *Tertullian* ſays, 'twas *the Son of God who ſpoke to* Moſes. Eccl. Hiſt. p. 6, 7. And *Euſebius* ſays expreſsly, (h) it was Chriſt who appear'd to *Abraham*; and he ſtiles him God, and that *Abraham* worſhipp'd him as God: And adds, *That it was impious to ſay that theſe Appearences of God were only of Angels, the Miniſters of God.*

Excuſe this D'greſſion; and I return to your Quotation out P. 13. of *Juſtin*, taken from *p.* 284, 285. And I ask,

Why did you ſtop ſo unfairly by drawing a Line——— after theſe Words, *Begotten voluntarily (by the Will) of the Father*; for the very next words are, (i) *But not ſuch as we ſee begotten among us*: And then he goes on to illuſtrate the Generation of the Son of God by the Similitude of a Word ſpoken by us, and of a Fire kindled by another Fire, which is not leſſen'd by that which was kindled by it, but remains ſtill the ſame. (k) '*To me*, ſays he, *will bear Witneſs the Word of Wiſdom, himſelf being that* God *begotten of the Father of all things, and being the* Word, *and* Wiſdom, *and* Power, *and* Glory *of him that begat him*, as *Solomon* ſays. And here is inſerted a

---

(g) Qui ad Moyſen loquebatur ipſe erat Filius Dei.

(h) Ὤφθαι φησὶν ὁ θεὸς ἀνείρηται διά τις καὶ μοὶ ἄνθρωπος τῷ Ἀβραάμ· ὁ δὲ προσκυνεῖ μὲν ὡς θεὸν, ἱκετεύει δὲ ὡς κύριον——— καὶ μὴν ὁρᾷ παρεστηκότας ἀγγέλους καὶ λειτουργοῦντας θεῷ τοὺς ἀναγεγραφυῖας θεοφανείας ὑπονοεῖν δεῖ.

(i) Ἀλλ' ὁ τοιοῦτον ὁποῖον καὶ ἐξ ἡμῶν γενόμενον ὁρῶμεν.

(k) Μαρτυρήσῃ δέ μοι ὁ λόγος τὴν σοφίαν, αὐτὸς ὢν ὅστος ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθεὶς καὶ λόγος καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις καὶ δόξα τοῦ γεννήσαντος ὑπάρχων.

great

great Part of the 8th Chapter of *Proverbs*, as a Proof of what *Juſtin* had ſaid; and then, as a further Proof, he quotes the 1ſt of *Geneſis*, *Let us make Man*, &c. which, he ſays, was ſpoken at leaſt to the Son of God, (as *Origen* does alſo in his Comment on St. *John*, *l.* 5. *p.* 257.) and makes it an Evidence of his Divinity, and expoſes the abſurd Anſwers of the *Jews*; and then adds the other Text, *Man is become like one of us*, as full Proof of the Son's Divinity, ſaying, (1) *Does not the Saying*, Like one of us, *denote at leaſt* Two *who ſubſiſted together with each other? And can the Doctors ſhew it was ſpoken to Angels and ſo make Man's Body the Creature of Angels?*

Then follows the latter Part of the Quotation, which you have render'd very differently from the Original, as will appear by comparing them.

Mr. WHISTON.	In the GREEK.
'But the Production which 'really proceeded from the Fa- 'ther before all Creatures, was 'with the Father, and to him 'did the Father ſpeak, as the 'Word declares by Solomon; 'For in the Beginning, *before* 'all Creatures, this very Off- 'ſpring was produced by God; 'which by Solomon *is ſtil'd* 'Wiſdom.	(m) *But indeed this* Begotten *of the* Father *was with the* Father *before* all *his Works, and with him the* Father *conferr'd, as the Word by* Solomon *has declar'd; For that he himſelf was begotten by God, both* the Principle, *before all his Works, and his* Offspring, *which is by* Solomon *call'd* Wiſdom.

To this very ill Tranſlation you add your own worſe Comment. [Alluding to *Prov.* viii. 22. &c. where 'tis ſaid, God *created Wiſdom the Beginning of his Ways for his Works.*]

Juſtin does indeed quote the 8th of the *Proverbs*, as I have before obſerv'd; but 'tis to prove the direct contrary, both of what by your Tranſlation you wiſh him to ſay, and of your

---

(1) ἀκῶν εἰπὼν, ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀλλήλοις ζωόντων καὶ τὸ ἐλάχιστον δύο μεμιῶυκεν——— ἢ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ἀποδεῖξαι δύναν]αι ὅτι ἀγγέλοις ἔλεγεν ἢ ὅτι ἀγγέλων πτίσμα ἐῶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον.

(m) Ἀλλὰ τῶτο τὸ τοῦ ὄντι ἀπὸ τῦ πατρὸς γενόμενον γέννημα πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων ζωὴν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τότῳ ὁ πατὴρ προσομιλεῖ, ὡς ὁ λόγος διὰ τῦ σολόμωνος, ὅτι καὶ ἀρχὴ πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων τοῦ αὐτὸ καὶ γέννημα ἀπὸ τῦ θεῦ ἐγένετο ὁ σοφία ὑπὸ τῦ σολομῶνος καλεῖται.

Conſtruction of the 8th of the *Proverbs*; and therefore you uſe him and your Reader very hardly, to ſay, he alludes to this Chapter for the Support of both.

And you have taken great Liberty in tranſlating ἀρχὴ, (not ἀρχῇ) *In the Beginning*, for 'tis turning the *Nominative* into the *Dative* Caſe.

I think it is plain, by the whole Tenor of *Juſtin*'s Diſcourſe that it is ſo far from countenancing your Opinion, that it over-
P. 13. throws it; and therefore I will make no further Comment upon it, but what *Trypho*'s Anſwer, which you quote, gives me Occaſion to do: He ſays, *Let him be own'd by you, as Lord, Chriſt and God, as the Scriptures declare: But for us, who are the Worſhippers of that God, who made him, we ſtand in no need of ſuch a* Confeſſion, *or ſuch a* Worſhip.

From this Paſſage it is plain, that *Trypho* acknowledges that the Scriptures declare Chriſt to be *Lord and God*; and tho' he ſays, *p.* 289. (n) *That he was aſtoniſh'd with the many Texts* cited by *Juſtin*, and particularly *knew not what to ſay to that of* Iſaiah, *I am God, and will not give my Glory to another*; yet, with the Obſtinacy of a *Jew*, he ſtill ſtiles him a *made* God, (and thus far you tread in his Steps, tho' 'tis an odd Sort of Chriſtianity that is learn'd from a *Jew*.) But then his Objection to this Notion is ſurely very juſt, That they, who worſhip the *God* that *made* him, have no need of *ſuch* a God, or *ſuch a* Worſhip; and it is incumbent on you, who profeſs this Doctrine, to give ſome Anſwer to it; for till you do, the *Jews* are not like to be your Proſelytes, tho' you boaſt againſt us, that 'tis our Doctrine which gives them Offence.

P. 30. I proceed to your other Teſtimonies, which you repreſent ſo partially, and in ſuch a manner, as by the like Method, a Man may prove, even out of the Scriptures, any the moſt abſurd and impious Propoſition.

P. 15. In your Quotation out of *Athenagoras*, in which the Son is ſaid to be the Firſt Production of the Father, *not as a Being made*; you add of your own, (for 'tis not in the Book) *out of nothing*. Thus you qualify a plain and abſolute Propoſition of your Author; and to refute his poſitive Aſſertion, that the Son was *not a Being made*, you would have him underſtood to mean by impoſing upon him your Senſe, *not made of Nothing*, leaving your Reader to chuſe which of the contradictory Propoſitions (which I have before taken notice of) he pleaſes, as to the Subſtance of which he was made, provided he will agree with you that he was *made*.

(n) Ὑπὸ σοῦ τοσούτων γραφῶν δυσωπούμενος οὐκ οἶδα τί φῶ σοὶ ἢ γραφῆς ἦν ἔφη Ἡσαίας καθ' ὃν ὁ θεὸς οὐδενὶ ἑτέρῳ δῶναι τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ λέγει ἅπως εἶπον ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦτό μου ὄνομα τὴν δόξαν μου ἑτέρῳ οὐ μὴ δώσω.

Thus

Thus you treat *Irenæus* alſo, for you own that he ſays Chriſt was *God's Eternal Word, unmade*; and yet you ſuppoſe his Meaning alſo to be, *not made out of Nothing*. *Irenæus* further ſays, that he *always coexiſted with the Father, and was ever with him*: To which your Anſwer is very pretty, *viz.* and *he avoided ſaying, that God created him*: Pray how was it poſſible for him to ſay this laſt, after he had ſaid the firſt? *Eternal, Unmade*, and yet *Created*, could be ſaid by none, who knew what a Contradiction was; and only by one, who could have a Notion of a *made* God. P. 26.

You quote out of *Tertullian*, '*What other Characteriſtick is* P. 16.
'*there of God than Eternity?* I agree, that without it he would not be God; and therefore all your Quotations, and your own Aſſertions, that our Saviour is God, are vain, and ſerve only to amuſe or abuſe the World, if you do not believe him to be *Eternal*.

But to return to *Athenagoras*.

Perhaps it may be too nice an Objection to your Tranſlation of δι' ὑπερβολὴν ζωήσεως, *out of your Depth of Underſtanding*, to tell you that ὑπερβολὴ is *Exceſs*, and may be not a Compliment, but a Reproof of their Curioſity in deſiring to pry into Myſteries unfathomable. But let this paſs.

(o) Why did you omit what immediately preceded your Quotation, *viz.* '*The Father and the Son being* One; *the Son be-*
'*ing in the Father, and the Father in the Son, in Unity and Power*
'*of the Spirit; the Son of God is the Mind, or Wiſdom, or Word*
'*of the* Father?

And immediately after your Quotation follows:

(p) *And we ſay that the Holy Ghoſt working in the Prophets, is*
'*the Efflux of God flowing from and reflected back to him, as*
'*the Rays of the Sun: Who then would not wonder, that ſhould*
'*hear them call'd Athieſts, who acknowledge* God the Father,
'God the Son, *and the* Holy Ghoſt, *ſhewing both their* Power
'*in* Unity, *and their* Diſtinction *in* Order?

Surely *Athenagoras* is a Chriſtian Writer before the Days of *Athanaſius*, and does here aſſert the *Three Perſons* to be *One God*; and yet in your Letter to the Biſhop of *London*, you P. 19.
challenge any Man to produce one that does ſo; and I obſerve, that you there allow *Tertullian* does ſo, but you therefore

---

(o) Ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὄντος τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν πατρὶ καὶ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ ἑνότητι καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος: νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

(p) Καὶ τι αὐτὸ ἐνεργοῦν τοῖς ἐκφωνοῦσι προφητικῶς ἄλογον πνεῦμα ἀπόῤῥοιαν εἶναι φαμὲν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπορρέον καὶ ἀναπεμπόμενον ὡς ἀκτῖνα ἡλίου· τίς ἂν οὐκ ἀπῤῥῆσαι λέγοντας θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν θεὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον δεικνυμένους καὶ ἐν ἑνώσει δυνάμιν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλουμένους.

doubt

doubt whether *he may be call'd a Catholick Writer, and that this is contrary to his own uſual Way of ſpeaking*: Why then do you quote him in your Letter to me, if he be not of good Authority? Why do you not produce ſuch Paſſages out of him, as are according to his uſual Way of ſpeaking? Thoſe which you have inſtanced in, are neither *fairly* nor *truly* ſtated by you; nay, what he does ſay in thoſe Places is *directly* and *expreſsly* againſt you, as I come now to ſhew.

P. 15. At the End of your firſt Quotation out of *Tertullian*, *adv. Prax.* §. 5. you put *&c.* *For before all Things God was alone*, &c.

Now this *&c.* is the moſt extraordinary and unfair that ever I met with, as Mankind will judge by the Words immediately following, and to which your *&c.* relates.

'*God was alone*: (q) *But therefore alone, becauſe there is no extrinſical Thing beſides him*; *but indeed* not *even then* alone, *for he had with him his* Reaſon: *This the* Greeks *call* Logos.

Your Second Quotation out of *Tertullian* I may take notice of, when I come to your Texts of Scripture.

In your Third Quotation, why did you not proceed, but ſtop at the Words, *The Lord created me the Beginning of his*
P. 15. *Ways?* for immediately he adds, that *he was* begotten; and thereupon ſays, (r) 'Hence *making him equal to himſelf*, by 'proceeding *from whom he is made the* Son: *The firſt begotten*, 'as *being begotten* before *all Things*; *and the* Only *begotten*, *as* 'alone *begotton* out *of God*.

By this 'tis plain, that he, as well as *Juſtin*, did not conſtrue the Text in the *Proverbs* as you do; for how could a created Being be equal to God himſelf? And if Begotten and Created be the ſame Thing, as you ſay, how could he be ſaid to be the *only begotten*, as *alone begotton*? for then he muſt be not only the *Beginning* of his Creatures, but the *only* Creature.

P. 16. The laſt Quotation out of *Tertullian* ends, *He begat me before the Hills*. This you mean as a Proof, that the Son of God is a Creature.

But why ſhould you put any other Conſtruction upon theſe Words of *Tertullian*, when apply'd to the Son, than you will do upon the ſame in *Pſalm* xc. 2. from whence they are taken, and where they are apply'd to the Father, *as God from Everlaſting to Everlaſting*; and that *Tertullian* ſo meant them; and to

---

(q) Solus autem quia nihil aliud extrinſecus præter illum, cæterùm nè tunc quidem ſolus, habebat enim ſecum rationem ——hanc Græci λόγον dicunt.

(r) Exindè tum parem ſibi faciens, de quo procedendo filius factus eſt, primogenitus, ut ante omnia genitus, & unigenitus ut ſolus ex Deo genitus.

ex-

expreſs, as well as we are able, what is inconceivable, (and which no Words can expreſs, as *Euſebius* and *Origen* declare) *viz.* the Eternal Generation of the Son of God; he adds in the Words of the Scripture, *The Son* is the *Word*, and the *Word* is *God*, and *I and my Father are one*: So that I may ſay to you, as he concludes this Paſſage to *Hermogenes*, §. 19. '*But he takes* '*Occaſion from ſome Words, as is the Manner of Hereticks, to di-* '*ſtort plain and ſimple Things.*

And that this is expreſsly *Tertullian*'s Opinion, will be manifeſt by another Paſſage; *viz.* (r) '*We have learnt, that he* '(Chriſt) *proceeded out of God, and by that Prolation was begot-* '*ten, and therefore was ſaid to be the Son of God, and God from* '*the Unity of Subſtance.* And then he illuſtrates it by the Sun and its Rays, and ſays, '*The Subſtance is not ſeparated, but ex-* '*tended*; and then repeats, '*What proceeds from God, is God,* '*and the Son of God, and both are one.* Apolog. adv. Gentes, c. 21.

I come now to your Teſtimonies out of *Origen*.

The firſt is taken out of *Origen contra Celſum*, p. 238. P. 16.

'*They are illuminated by that Wiſdom, which is the Efflux* (*or* '*Splendor*) *of the Eternal Light.*

They, who? I gueſs you were aſham'd to tell me. For this is a very extraordinary Paſſage, and I wonder you would quote it; for as great Skill and Delight as you have in Aſtronomy, I did not imagine you would give any Countenance to the Opinion of *Origen*, which introduces it; for he ſays, (v) '*The Stars in Heaven are Rational Animals, and good, and* (thus far of the Paſſage you omit, and then put *&c.* and begin *They*) '*were enlighten'd* with the Light of Knowledge *by* '*Wiſdom, which is the Efflux of the Eternal Light.*

This Notion he had from *Plato*, who indeed carry'd it a little further, (in his 12th and 13th Books *de Leg.*) *making the Sun, Moon and Stars not only endued with Reaſon, but even to be Gods.* And it *Origen*, in ſome of his Writings, has tranſplanted any more of *Plato*'s Notions into Divinity, it is no wonder; for he was ſo good a Proficient in that Philoſophy, that when he came into the School of *Plotinus*, he was offer'd his Desk, as

---

(r) Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, & Prolatione generatum, & idcirco Filium Dei & Deum dictum ex Unitate Subſtantiæ—Etiam radius ex ſole porrigitur, portio ex ſummâ ſed ſol erit in radio quia ſolis eſt radius, nec ſeperatur ſubſtantia ſed extenditur; quod de Deo profectum eſt Deus eſt, & Dei Filius, & unus ambo.

(v) Οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστέρες ζῶα εἰσι λογικὰ καὶ σπουδαῖα καὶ ἐφωτίσθησαν τῷ φωτὶ τῆς γνώσεως ὑπὸ τῆς σοφίας ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς ἀϊδίου.

one

one fitter to read Lectures there, than to be an Auditor of them.

But (to ſay no more of this wild Notion) this Paſſage will not ſupport your Opinion, that the *Son of God is a Creature*: On the contrary, this Expreſſion, *the Efflux of the Eternal Light*, is us'd by ſeveral of the Authors to whom you have referr'd me, to denote his *Identity* in Eſſence with the Father: So *Tertullian* compares *his Generation to the Ray of the Sun, which is ſhot forth from the Sun; but the Sun is in that Ray, for it is a Ray of it*, &c. And *Origen* here a little after explains himſelf to the ſame Purpoſe, by citing St. *John*, (k) *God is Light; the Son of God is the true Light, that lighteth every Man that cometh into the World.* And himſelf ſays, *I am the Light of the World.* And that he means the Divinity of our Saviour, is plain by his citing this and other Texts expreſly to prove it: (l) *I am the Light of the World.* 'I *am* Alpha *and* Omega, *the* 'Beginning *and the* End, *the* Firſt *and the* Laſt.' And introduces them with ſaying, 'The *greateſt and moſt perfect Accounts* 'of Jeſus *were reſerv'd for* him, *who lay in his Boſom*; *for none* '(*of the Evangeliſts*) *has ſo* purely *and* clearly *manifeſted his* 'Divinity *as St.* John.

Adv. Gentes, c. 21.

Comment. in Johan. p. 5.

P. 17. Your Second Quotation out of *Origen contra Celſum*, L. 5. p. 257. ends thus: *The Sacred Oracles declare him to be the* ancienteſt *of all* Creatures.

What *Origen* muſt mean by the firſt Part of this Paſſage, *the Son of God*, the *Firſt-born of every Creature*; and the Concluſion, *the ancienteſt of all Creatures*, will be beſt explain'd by what he himſelf ſays in another Place; where, after he had quoted the Text in St. *Matth.* xi. 17. (m) *No Man knoweth the* Son, *but the* Father, *&c.* he adds, *For the* Unmade *and* Firſt-born *of all* created *Nature*, none *can know according to his* Dignity, *as the* Father *does, who begat him, nor the* Father *ſo as the* living Word *and his Wiſdom and Truth.*

πάσης κτίσεως. Contra Celſ. l. 6. p. 287.

What I have to ſay to that Expreſſion, *the Firſt-born*, &c. I reſerve till I come to the Text in the *Coloſſians*; but at preſent

---

(k) Ὁ θεὸς φῶς ὄν, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς ἀληθινόν ὄν ὁ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου.

(l) Οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐκείνων ἀκράτως ἐφανέρωσεν αὐτῷ τὴν θεότητα, ὡς Ἰωάννης, παρεσήσας αὐτὸν λέγοντα, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ α καὶ τὸ ω, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος.

(m) Οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ——— ὅτε γὰρ τὸ ἀγένητον καὶ πάσης γενητῆς φύσεως πρωτότοκον καὶ ἀξίαν εἰδέναι τις δύναται ὡς ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατὴρ, ὅτε τὸ πατέρα, ὡς ὁ ἔμψυχος λόγος καὶ σοφία αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλήθεια.

I muſt

I muſt obſerve, that your Senſe of *Firſt-born*, and the *antienteſt of all Creatures*, cannot poſſibly conſiſt with what I have laſt cited, in which the Son of God is expreſsly ſaid to be *Unmade* (ἀγέννητος); an *Unmade* or *Uncreated Creature*, is Nonſenſe: And if you will not interpret the Words you have cited by thoſe I have laſt mention'd, you will make *Origen* to aſſert Contradictions; for *Unmade* and *Firſt-born* are join'd together.

And if you would have added the very next Words to your Quotation, *viz.* (n) *And God the* Father *ſaid to him, Let* Us *make Man after* Our *Image and Likeneſs*; I have already obſerv'd, that *Juſtin* makes this Text an Argument of the *Divinity* of the *Son of God*, and hope to ſhew it by other Authorities when I come to it.

Your next Quotation is out of *Origen*'s Comment on *Pſalm* i. p. 38. P. 17.

'*Pray to the* Father *the* God *of the* Univerſe, *thro' our* Saviour, '*as High-Prieſt, who is the* made *God.*

This you have render'd very *perverſly* and *falſly*; and your Reaſon for ſo doing is very obvious, by comparing it with the literal and true Tranſlation of it; *viz.*

Pray to the Father *the* God *of the* Univerſe, (i) *thro' our* Saviour *and* High-Prieſt, *the* Begotten *God.*

Your next Quotation is alſo out of the ſame Book, *p.* 31. as follows: *Thou art my Son, this Day have I* begotten *thee.* '*This* '*is ſaid to the* Son *of* God, *with whom it is always* to-day, '*for there is no* Evening *with* God: *I do alſo ſuppoſe, that neither is there any* Morning *with him; but that a* Time coextended *with his* Unmade *and* Eternal Life *is, if I may ſo ſay,* that Day, *or* to-day, *with him in which the* Son *was* made, '*the Beginning of his* Origin *being thus* not *found neither of this* 'Day. P. 17. *This is in his Comment on St.* John, *wherein he cites this Verſe of the 2d* Pſalm, *p.* 31.

This is ſo full and expreſs againſt you, that I wonder you ſhould quote it; but I perceive you have ventur'd upon it, for the Sake of Two Words in your Tranſlation, *Made* and *Origin*, which in the *Greek* are γεγώνται and γενέσεως, the firſt ſignifies *was born*, and the ſecond his *Geniture* or *Nativity*; and both ſhould have been ſo render'd, as moſt ſuitable and agreeable to the Word γεγέννηκα, *I have begotten thee.*

I have now done with your Quotations out of *Origen*, and hope I have ſufficiently ſhewn, that theſe your Teſtimonies (if you reckon them among the Principal, which concern this

---

(n) Καὶ ἀυτῷ ὁ θεὸς ὡς τὸ ἀνθρώπε δημιεργίας εἰρηκέναι, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμετέραν.

(i) Διὰ τὸ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ ἀρχιερέως γεγονότος θεοῦ.

impor-

important Queſtion, *p.* 2.) are of little Uſe to ſupport your Opinion, that the *Son of God is a Creature.* But after all, I believe we ſhall both agree, that *Origen* has ſome Opinions ſo very ſtrange and heterodox, that we ſhall concur in rejecting them; and if in this preſent Queſtion he ſhould be found to have declared different Opinions, ſurely thoſe are to be rejected, which are founded on his own, ſcarce Philoſophical, Notions; and, if he be of any Authority, what he ſays founded on the Scripture, which he quotes, and ſupported by the concurrent Teſtimonies of other Great and Holy *Fathers* interpreting thoſe Texts, and applying them to the *Divinity of the Son of God*, ought in Reaſon to be preferr'd and moſt valued: And I ſhall ſum up all in his own Words? (k) 'The God *and* 'Father *of* all *is not* alone *great, for he made the* Only-begotten 'and Firſt-born *of every* Creature Partaker *of* himſelf, *and of* 'his Greatneſs, *that He being the* Image *of the* Inviſible God, 'ſhould keep the Image *of the* Father *even in* Greatneſs; *for it* 'was not poſſible for him to be *the* Commenſurate *and* fair Image 'of *the* Inviſible God, *unleſs he exhibited* the Image *alſo of his* 'Greatneſs.' And in another Place he accordingly ſtiles *the Son*, (l) the *Glorify'd God*, the *Word.*

Contra Celſ. *l.* 6. p. 323.

Surely this is more than a *Metaphyſical* Exiſtence, as you impute to the Ancients, *p.* 14. more 'than that he was in a ſub-'til manner, *virtually, potentially, or as his Internal Wiſdom in* 'his Father *from all Eternity*, p. 26.

Com. in Johan. p. 8.

What I have here tranſcribed out of the aforeſaid Authors, and what I have obſerv'd upon them, methinks may help you out of the Difficulty under which you labour, when you ſay, 'How *a* confeſſedly (*you ſhould have added*, neceſſarily) *deriv'd*, 'produc'd, *and* Begotten Being, *an* Only begotten Son, *ſhould be* 'really Coeternal *with his* Underiv'd Unbegotten, *and* neceſſa-'rily *Exiſting* Father, Author *and* Producer, *I cannot poſſibly* 'underſtand.

P. 28, 29.

Indeed, if you meaſure this Myſtery by natural Generations here on Earth, 'tis inconceivable how a *Son* ſhould be *Coeval* with his *Father*; it is impoſſible: But ſurely our ſhallow Underſtandings are not the Meaſure of *Infinity.* We own this Myſtery is incomprehenſible; and ſo is the *Eternity of God.* It is hard to conceive, how any Thing can exiſt without a

---

(k) Ὁυ μόνος ὢν μέγας καθ' ἡμᾶς ὅτιν ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ, μετεδωκε γὰρ ἑαυτῦ καὶ τ μεγαλειότητος τῷ μονογενεῖ καὶ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσης κτίσεως, ἵν', εἰκὼν αὐτος τυγχάνων τῦ ἀοράτυ θεῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ μεγέθει σώζῃ τ εἰκόνα τῦ πατρός, ὁ γὰρ οἷον τ' ἦν εἶναι (σύμμετρον (ἵν' ἄτως ὀνομάσω) καὶ καλῶ εἰκόνα τῦ ἀοράτυ θεῦ, μὴ καὶ τὸ μεγέθος παρισάσαν τ εἰκόνα.

(l) Αὐτὸς ἦ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ δεδοξασμένος θεὸς λόγος.

Cauſe;

Cauſe; and yet we believe *God* to be *Self-exiſtent*: And in this Caſe before us, I may ſay to you, (as our Saviour does in another) *Do you not therefore err, becauſe you know not the Scriptures, neither the* Power *of* God? *For the Things that are in* Heaven, who *hath* ſearched out? Mark xii. 24. Wiſd. ix. 16.

I muſt own, that there are ſome Paſſages in theſe Authors, (whom, by your Quotations out of them, you have directed me to conſult) which ſeem to countenance your Doctrine; but it cannot with any Colour of Truth be deny'd, but that they do alſo *plainly*, and in *expreſs Terms* aſſert the *Trinity*, and that the *Father* is *God*, the *Son* is *God*, and the *Holy Ghoſt* is *God*. But with great Humility and Submiſſion to *Learned* Men, I conceive, that a fair Account may be given of this ſeeming Difference from themſelves; for when they ſpeak of this adorable *Myſtery* in *general*, they with an aweful Reverence acknowledge this Revelation, and declare the *Divinity* of each of the Three Perſons in *poſitive* and *abſolute* Terms: But then ſome, perhaps out of a pious and well intended Zeal, have endeavour'd to illuſtrate this incomprehenſible Myſtery by Similitudes and Repreſentations taken from worldly Things, (as, from *Light*, *Human Generations*, &c.) though they own no Words can expreſs it; and therefore 'tis no wonder, that in theſe Caſes their Compariſons of *finite* Things with *infinite*, ſhould not ony fall ſhort, but their Expreſſions muſt of Neceſſity, if *ſtrictly* taken, lead Men into *Error*; who interpret their poſitive Aſſertions of the *Trinity*, and of the *Divinity* of the Three Perſons by their Repreſentations of it, inſtead of conſtruing candidly thoſe imperfect Repreſentations by the Rule and Standard of our *Faith*, which they have fully declared from the Scriptures, and which they quote to confirm their Doctrine; of which the Primitive Chriſtians were ſo fully couvinc'd, and particularly the *Divinity* of the *Son of God* was ſo entirely believ'd as an irreſiſtible *Truth*, that ſome by attempting to explain it, have fall'n into downright Hereſy. And *Novatian* very ingeniouſly argues from thence, that he was, even in their Opinion alſo, *truly* God: For as he ſays, (p) 'He *is ſo truly God, but as the Son of God*, 'begotten of God, *that ſome Hereticks have thought him not a* Son, 'but *the very* Father *himſelf*; and (q) *others thought he was ſo* 'much God, *as that he was not* Man. And as much as *Novatian* blames others, he himſelf, when he attempts to explain the Trinity, does it in a manner almoſt inconſiſtent with his plain Aſſertions of it. So wild and unaccountable muſt Men be, Novat. c. 17. Orig. contra Celſ. *l.* 6. *p.* 323.

(p) Qui uſque adeò Deus eſt (ſed quà Filius Dei natus ex Deo) ut plerique illum hæretici ita Deum acceperint, ut non Filium ſed Patrem pronunciandum putarent.

(q) Et alii quoque hæretici uſq; adeò eum Deum eſſe, ut quidam illum, ſubſtracto homine, tantummodo putaverint Deum.

when

when they ſuffer their Thoughts to wander, and to pry into Things above our Faculties, which you ſay, even the *Scriptures do not meddle with*, (and I ſay too, not *meddle* with them otherwiſe than to reveal them as *Truths* to be *believ'd*) and *which the Angels deſire to look into*: For *none know the* Son, *but the* Father, *nor the Things of* God, *but the* Spirit *of* God. For *how ſhould thy Veſſel be able to comprehend the Ways of the Higheſt*, which are paſt finding out? Theſe are Objects of our *Faith*, not of our *Knowledge*; for *Faith* would not be a *Virtue*, *Faith* would not be *Faith*, but *Knowledge*, if nothing was to be believ'd, but what may by our Ratiocinations be made out to our Comprehenſion. When *Athanaſius* ſays, *As the reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man, ſo God and Man is one Chriſt*; no Man pretends that this is an *adequate* Repreſentation of the Incarnation of the *Son of God*, tho' it may be the beſt and neareſt that we can arrive at; and even this ſurpaſſes our Underſtanding, how a *material* and *immaterial* Subſtance ſhould be united in *one* Perſon; how *periſhable* Duſt and Aſhes ſhould be animated and endued with an *immortal* Soul, a Particle of *Divinity*: How much leſs can we conceive, how *God* himſelf ſhould be *Hypoſtatically* join'd with *Man*; and ſtill leſs than this, how *Three* Perſons in the *Eternal* Deity ſhould be *One* God: But when *we ſhall come to ſee him Face to Face*, and our Faculties ſhall be enlarged, *we ſhall then know him even as we are known*. In the mean time, we muſt be content *to ſee thro' a Glaſs darkly*, and to let our *Faith be the Evidence of theſe Things not ſeen*; not becauſe we can give a *Philoſophical* Account of them, but becauſe the *Word* of *Truth* has ſpoken them.

P. 25. 1 Pet. i. 12. Matth. xi. 27. 1 Cor. ii. 11. 2 Eſdr. iv. 10. 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Heb. xi. 1.

I ſhould now have done with your Teſtimonies; for from theſe which I have examin'd I may reaſonably conclude, that the reſt have been forg'd upon the ſame Anvil; and I pray *God* he may never ſay to you, *Who is this that darkneth Counſel, and by ſuppreſſing Words in his Heart, thinks to conceal them from me?*

Septuag. Job xxxviii. 2.

But becauſe you boaſt, that the great *Euſebius* (as you ſtile him) is your Friend; that none of the truly Learned will pretend that he was an *Athanaſian*, tho' he ſubſcrib'd the Council of *Nice*, (which perhaps you will not allow to be a ſufficient Argument for it, becauſe there are ſome modern Examples who have *ſubſcrib'd* our Articles, and *declar'd* before *God* and *Man* their *Aſſent* and *Conſent* to our *Creeds*, and yet have renounced publickly that *Faith* which they then *ſolemnly* profeſs'd;) and becauſe you ſay, that the Fathers, and particularly *Euſebius*; notwithſtanding their poſitive and expreſs Aſſertions of the *Coeternity* of the *Son of God*, meant no more than 'a *metaphyſical* 'or *potential Eternity*, p 9. *that he was before the World be-* 'gan, p. 27. *as we are aſſured by many clearer and plainer Paſſa-* 'ges, wherein *they directly and abſolutely deny the* Son's Coeter- 'nity *with the Father*; I muſt not entirely paſs over your

P. 33. P. 9, & 27.

Quotations out of an Author you ſo greatly rely on: One I have already taken notice of, and made my Remarks upon; I will go on to the others. But firſt, I will repeat ſhortly what you allow *Euſebius* to aſſert for the *Eternity* of the *Son of God*, and then ſtate your Quotations by which you pretend to overrule thoſe Aſſertions; that by this Compariſon it may be ſeen which are the plaineſt and cleareſt.

You *allow*, for indeed it cannot be *deny'd*, that *Euſebius* ſays P. 27. that the Generation of the Son was ἀΐδιον, *Eternal*; that he was *always*, ἀνάρχον, *Beginningleſs*, and at *all* Times with the *Father*, elder than *all* Times and *all* Ages; that he ſubſiſted from *endleſs Ages*, that he reign'd with his *Father* from *beginningleſs Ages*, to which you add that of the Presbyters of *Alexandria*, that *God* begat him before *Eternal* Times

Now I deſire you to tell me, whether there be Words in any Language to expreſs the Doctrine I am contending for more *plainly* and fully than theſe, which you have furniſh'd to me out of *Irenæus* before-mention'd, and here out of *Euſebius*, and from the Presbyters of *Alexandria*. I obſerve you have ventur'd to tranſlate ἀΐδιος, *Eternal*, notwithſtanding you ſay *p.* 28. it does not always ſo ſignify; and ἀνάρχος, *Beginningleſs*, notwithſtanding your *improper* and *untrue* Interpretation of it, *p.* 8, and 9, *to be only before the Beginning of the World*, tho' it cannot ſignify leſs than to be *without a beginning*; *and if* ἀπ' αἰῶνος ſingly ſhould, as you ſay, *p* 28. *ſeldom* or *never* ſignify *a proper* Eternity; yet ſurely with the Epithet *Beginningleſs*, it muſt ſignify *Eternity*; for what ſubſiſts and had *no* Beginning is *properly* Eternal. Now can you think to perſuade any Man of common Senſe, by your bold and peremptory Aſſertions, that theſe Authors do not mean what they ſay; or, in your words, *meant no more than that he was before the world began*; and that there are, or can be plainer and clearer Paſſages in theſe Authors to ſupport your Aſſertion? Do they recant their own Aſſertions, and in expreſs Terms declare, (as you do, *p.* 18. of your Letter to the Biſhop of *London*) that '*in* '*their younger Years they had by Cuſtom been betray'd into ſuch a* '*fatal Miſtake*; That you do not pretend to ſay; and yet leſs than this will ſcarce be ſufficient to juſtify your Charge againſt them: I am ſure the Quotations which you have pick'd out of them, (and I ſuppoſe they are the ſtrongeſt, or you have been very unfortunate in your Choice) do not do it, even tho' they had been true; which I have ſhewn they are not, in what I have examin'd and ſhall now ſhew in *Euſebius*, who, as your Friend, might have expected better Uſage from you.

The firſt Quotation is, '*Wiſdom does ſubſtantially ſubſiſt, and* P. 19. *was created by God, before the World began*, &c.

Here you have given us another *&c.* with which you end that Paragraph; and then immediately you proceed to your next Quotation, *viz.*

Præpar. Evang. c. 11. p. 313.

'Solomon, *ſays* Euſebius *elſewhere, gives us the ſame Senſe in* 'other Language; *and uſing the Name of Wiſdom inſtead of the* 'Word, *makes this Declaration, as in her Perſon* ———

Now what can any Reader underſtand by this, but only what immediately preceded, *viz. That Wiſdom does ſubſtantially ſubſiſt*, and *was created before the World began*; eſpecially ſince you do not mention this Declaration, but ſtop with a Stroke——at the word *Perſon.*

But in *Euſebius* the Matter ſtands thus:

In the Beginning of the Chapter, he tells us the Account which the *Jews*, and particularly *Moſes* and *David*, give of the

P. 312. *Logos*, viz. (p) 'The Hebrew *Oracles ſtile him the Second Cauſe* 'of all Things, the Word of God, and God of God, *as we* '(*Chriſtians*) *have been taught to theologize of him*; and Moſes 'plainly ſpeaks of Two Lords, *when he ſays* The Lord *rained* 'from the Lord *Fire and Brimſtone upon the City of the Wicked:* 'So he familiarly made the like Application of the Characters 'among the Hebrews *to* Both.

And here he mentions expreſsly what that Character (q) was, *viz.* the *Tetragrammaton*, that is, *Jehovah*, the incommunicable Name of the *Supreme God.*

Then he goes on:

(r) 'To him alſo David *concurring, ſays*, The Lord *ſaid to my* 'Lord, *Sit thou on my Right Hand*, &c. *For to whom elſe can we* 'be allow'd to imagine, *that the* Right Hand *ſhould be given by the* 'Unbegotten Deity, *but to* Him only *of whom we have been* 'ſpeaking, *whom the ſame Prophet elſewhere characterizes under* 'the Name of the Logos *of the* Father.

Matt. xxii. 44, 46.

And ſurely this is a very proper Argument; for it was urg'd by Chriſt himſelf, and *put the Phariſees to Silence.*

(p) Περὶ τοῦ δευτέρου, ὃν ὁ θεὸς λόγον καὶ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ εἶναι τὰ Ἑβραίων παιδεύματα: καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ θεολογεῖν διδάσκομεθα, ὁ μὲν δὴ Μωσῆς διαῤῥήδην δύο θεολογεῖ κυρίους, ἐν οἷς φησὶ, καὶ ἔβρεξε κύριος παρὰ κυρίου πῦρ καὶ θεῖον ὅτι τὴν τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλιν; ἔνθα συνήθως ὅτι τὸν δύο τὸ ὅμοιαν τὴν παρ' Ἑβραίων καρακτῆρων ἐποιήσατο προσάθεσιν, (q) αὐτὴ δ' ἦν διὰ τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων ἀνεκφώνητος παρ' αὐτοῖς θεολογία.

(r) Τέτῳ δὲ καὶ Δαβὶδ ἄλλος προφήτης καὶ βασιλεὺς Ἑβραίων Συμᾴδων φησὶν, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ——— τίνι γὰρ ἄλλῳ θέμις νοεῖν τὰ δεξιὰ διὰ τὸ ἀγεννήτου θεότητος παραχωρεῖσθαι ἢ μόνῳ τῷ περὶ οὗ ὁ λόγος ὃν ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης ἐν ἑτέροις λυκότερον διασαφεῖ λόγον τοῦ παιδὸς.

Then

Then he comes to your Quotation:

(r) ‘ His Son alſo and Succeſſor *Solomon gives us the ſame Senſe.*

What Senſe? Surely that which he had juſt before recited of the *Jews*, and of *Moſes*, and of his *Father David* in particular, *viz.* that the Characters among the *Hebrews*, even the Name of *Jehovah*, were alike apply'd to both *Father* and *Son*.

Your next Quotation is out of *Euſeb. Demonſtr. Evang.* l. 4. c. 3. in which Paſſage, if there be any Expreſſions capable of your Senſe, yet if in his other Writings he plainly declares, as he does, an Opinion contrary to what you would deduce from ſuch ambiguous Expreſſions; nay, if in this very Chapter he aſſerts the *Eternal* Generation of the *Son* of *God* in *clear* and *indiſputable* Terms, then ſurely in Reaſon the doubtful Expreſſions ſhould be conſtrued by thoſe; and the Conſtruction which you put upon the *doubtful*, ſhould not over-rule *direct* and *poſitive* Aſſertions. P. 19.

Again, if this were not the Caſe, yet it muſt be conſider'd, that *Euſebius*, who was contemporary with *Arius* and his Friend, is too late an Authority to overthrow the *Faith* and *Doctrine* of the *Antenicene* Fathers, as well as the Council of *Nice*, which affirm'd it.

But, as if you were conſcious, that *Euſebius* in this Paſſage had not ſaid enough for your Purpoſe, you leave out a great deal of it; and what you do cite, you inſert by Piecemeals in ſeveral diſtant Pages of your Letter. And laſtly, you groſsly miſ-tranſlate them, as will appear:

‘ *The Light does not ſhine forth by the Will of the luminous Bo-* P. 19.
‘ *dy, but by a neceſſary Property of Nature.*

In your Tranſlation.	In the GREEK.
(t) ‘ *But the* Son *by the In-* ‘ *tention and Will of the Fa-* ‘ ther *received his Subſiſtence,* ‘ *ſo as to be the Image of the* ‘ Father; *for by his Will did* ‘ *God become the Father of his* ‘ *Son, and caus'd to ſubſiſt a* ‘ *Second Light, in all Things* ‘ *like unto himſelf* —	(t) *But the* Son, *according to* Counſel *and* Choice, *became the Image of the* Father: *for* God being willing, *became the* Father *of the* Son, *and caus'd to ſubſiſt a* Second *Light, in* all *Things like unto himſelf.* P. 19, 20

(r) Καὶ ὁ τότε ὢν παῖς ὁμῶ καὶ διάδοχος Σολομὼν ἑτέρῳ χρῆται ῥήματι ἢ αὐτῷ παρισὰς διανοίαν.

(t) Ὁ ὢν υἱὸς κατὰ γνώμην καὶ προαίρεσιν εἰκὼν ὑπέστη τοῦ πατρὸς, βουληθεὶς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς γέγονεν υἱοῦ πατὴρ καὶ φῶς δεύτερον καὶ πάντα ἑαυτῷ ἀφομοιώμενον ὑπεστήσατο.

This you have omitted: (v) *The Unbegotten and Eternal Light being* One, *how can the Image be other than* One? *Does not the Splendor, or the Ray, being the Light, preſerve in all reſpects the Likeneſs of the Prototype? How can it be the Image of the very* One, *unleſs it ſelf alſo be* One?

Then follows a Paſſage which you have omitted in this Place, becauſe in your own Judgment it does not conſiſt with the Doctrine which you would have *Euſebius* to aſſert here; for you have cited it, p. 8. among the Authorites for the Coeternity of the Son of God; but have done it very aukwardly, and indeed have corrupted it, as will appear by

P. 8.

Your Tranſlation.

(x) *That the Son was begotten, not as having for* certain *Times not been, and* then being made; *but being before* all *Ages, and ſtill before them, and being always* preſent as a Son *with the Father*; but *not being unbegotten, but begotten of* the *Unbegotten Father, being the only Begotten, the Word, and God of God.*

This you have omitted:

The GREEK.

(x) *Our Theology repreſents the Son* Begotten, *not as* not being *in any Times, and* afterward begotten, *but as being and præexiſting before* Eternal *Ages, and as the Son being* together *always with the Father*; *not being unbegotten, but begotten of* his *Unbegotten Father, being the* only *Begotten, the* Word, *and* God *of* God;

It goes on:

(y) *not by a* Separation, Section *or* Diviſion, *out of the Father's Subſtance*; *but* ineffably *and beyond our Ratiocination, from Eternity, and*

(v) Ἀγλωνήτε γὰρ ὢν καὶ ἀϊδίε φωτὸς ὄντος ἑνὸς, πῶς ἂν γένοιτο ἄλλο οἷά τις εἰκὼν; ἡ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ φῶς καὶ πάντα τὸ ἐμφερὲς τῷ πρωτοτύπῳ σῴζουσα, πῶς ἂν εἴη εἰκὼν εἰ μὴ μία καὶ αὐτὴ οὖσα.

(x) Τὰ γὰρ μεθ' ἡμᾶς θεολογίας, &c. υἱὸν γεννητὸν μὲν χρόνοις μηδαμῶν οὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δὲ γεγονότα ἀλλὰ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ὄντα καὶ πρόντα καὶ πάλαι ὡς υἱὸν διαπαντὸς ζῶντα καὶ ἐξ ἀγεννήτε ὄντα γεννωμένον δὲ ἐξ ἀγεννήτε πάλαι μονογενῆ ὄντα, λόγον καὶ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ. (y) Οὐ κατὰ διάσταιν ἢ τομὴν ἢ διαίρεσιν ἐκ τῆς πάλαι οὐσίας προβεβλημένον, ἀῤῥήτως δὲ καὶ ἀνεπιλογίστως ἡμῖν.

(P) Re-

(P) Receiving, *before all Ages, a* real Subſiſtence *by the inexpreſſible and inconceivable* Will *and Power of the Father.*

(P) *Before all Ages, being ſubſtantiated of or according to the inexpreſſible and inconceivable Counſel and Power of the Father.* P. 20. ἐκ βελῆς.

This alſo you have omitted:

(9) *For, as 'tis ſaid,* Who can declare his Generation? *For as none knoweth the* Father, *but the* Son: *ſo none knoweth the* Son, *but the* Father *who begat him.*

I imagine your tranſlating βελὴ, *Will*, which it does not ſignify, rather than *Counſel*, which it properly does, was to ſupport your Opinion, that the Generation of the Son of God was not by *Neceſſity* of Nature, but *voluntary* by the *Will* of the *Father* when it pleas'd him; which you ſay, is the ſame Thing as Creation, and ſo he would be but a Creature. P. 29.

But ſurely this cannot be the Meaning of this Paſſage, for it would be inconſiſtent with the plain and expreſs Aſſertions in this Place. For,

1. How can that which was begotten, *not as not being in any Times, but being before Eternal Ages, beyond our Ratiocination from Eternity,* be ſaid to be a Creature?

2. If *Euſebius* meant to aſſert his *Generation* to be a *Creation*, why did he cite the Prophet's Queſtion, which implies a Negative, that *none can declare his Generation*, and give our Saviour's Reaſon for it, becauſe none knows the *Son* but the *Father*? which Text he quotes in another of his Books with this emphatical Expreſſion, καθ' ἀξίαν, none knoweth the Son *perfectly according to his Dignity*, but the *Father*. Eccl. Hiſt l. i. c. 2. p. 5.

And if he meant he was *created* by the *Will* of the *Father*, why did he add thoſe Epithets of *Inexpreſſible* and *Inconceivable Will?* For tho' we cannot conceive what the Nature and Eſſence may be of ſuch a *Created* Being, yet we can conceive that *Fact*, as well as that the *World* was *created* by his *Will*, *when he ſpake the Word, and it was made*; if that had been told us as plainly as this has been; or otherwiſe you muſt ſay, that 'tis inconceivable, that an Act of the Will ſhould be an Act of the Will, which is abſurd; nay, I may ſay, 'tis eaſier to con-

---

(P) Ἐξ ἀϊδίων μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἀνεκφοίτου καὶ ἀπεριννοήτου βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ὑπάρχων.

(9) Τὴν γὰρ γενεὰν αὐτοῦ, φησὶ, τίς διηγήσεται; καὶ ὥσπερ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ υἱὸς, οὕτω καὶ τὸν υἱὸν οὐδεὶς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν πατήρ.

ceive, that He, who was always in Being, as *Euſebius* here ſays, may be *form'd* by Almighty God into *Something more excellent*, than it is to conceive a *Creation out of Nothing*.

3. If you will inſiſt that Θελή ſhall ſignify *Will*, you ſhould at leaſt have tranſlated ἐκ Θελῆς, *of the Will*, as you do Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, *God of God*: For all the Attributes of God being *Eternal* and *Eſſential* to the Godhead, the *Will* is ſo too; and as the *Father* is *Light*, *Truth*, *Wiſdom*, &c. the *Son* is ſaid to be ſo alſo, as partaking of and anointed with all the *Paternal* Dignity, in the Language of *Euſebius* before-mention'd; and in that of St. *Paul*, *the bright Efflux of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Perſon*; and therefore the Son of his *Will* does no more denote his *Creation*, than the Son of his *Love*, or the Son of *God* do. Nay, 'tis in this manner that the *Nicene* Council has expreſs'd his *Coeternity* and *Conſubſtantiality*, (k) *Light* of *Light*, *very God of very God*, *begotten* not *made*: So that when you can prove, that the Reverend Fathers of that Council intended by thoſe Expreſſions, that the *Son of God* was a *Creature*, then you may interpret your Quotations of the like Expreſſions in the like manner; and add, if you pleaſe, that this is the Doctrine and Faith of the *Church* of *England* too; but till then, your confident Boaſtings of your Teſtimonies will not ſhake, but rather root us in *Faith*; ſuch Bluſtring will be like Wind to the ſtrong Oaks, 'twill only fix the Roots more faſt in the Ground.

1 John i. 5. John viii. 12. John xiv. 6. Heb. i. 3. Col. i. 13. Nicene Creed.

Euſebius gives us an Account of the Notion which *Plato* and his Diſciple *Plotinus* had of a Trinity, and ſpeaks of it with ſome Admiration of their great Penetration: I think this Inference may juſtly be drawn from it, That if ſuch Great Men did not think ſuch a Notion to be abſurd, ſurely you have been too forward and raſh to cenſure it as inconſiſtent with the *Light of Nature* and *common Senſe*. But, on the other Hand, if your *Euſebius* has been too much pleas'd with their Notions, and has any where us'd Expreſſions ſuited to it, I leave you to follow your admir'd Example, and to deduce Chriſtianity from Heathen Philoſophers, and to explain Divine Myſteries by the Reaſonings of Man.

Prepar. Evang. l. 4. c. 5, 6.

P. 37. *You bid me ſuppoſe my ſelf in a Court of Judicature, and review the Evidence you have produced; and then conſider, whether I could with a ſafe Conſcience determine on the Side of the* Athanaſians. My Anſwer is, That ſuch Evidence as you have given for your Cauſe, would not be accepted in any Court by any upright Judge, and conſequently you may eaſily conclude what the Judgment muſt be: Nay, I will add, that ſuch a Witneſs

(k) Φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα ὐ ποιηθέντα.

would

would hardly escape unpunish'd ; for 'tis his Duty to *speak* the *Truth*, and the *whole Truth* : But to mis-translate your Authors, to cite them by halves, and with *&c's*, leaving out plain and express Assertions against you, and adding of your own to them ; to distort their plain Words, and to interpret, or, rather, to declare dogmatically their Meaning contradictory to what they say, is such a Proceeding, as is no less than an Attempt to impose upon Mankind in the most provoking Manner.

Nay, you have not only corrupted your own Testimonies, but you are prepar'd to baffle the best that can be brought against you, which is the Scripture, in the very Foundation of all Religion ; for you are so fond of your Notion of a *made God*, and that the *Son of God* is a *Creature*, and consequently not *Eternal*, that to avoid the Consequence of the Application to him of the Expressions which in the Scriptures are us'd to denote the Eternity of God the Father, you have ventur'd upon a very bold Assertion, ' That *this Eternity of the Father is only* P. 25.
' suppos'd *to be express'd without Proof* ; *it no way appearing, that*
' *the Sacred Writers meddle* beyond our Faculties *with any such*
' absolute Eternity, *either* à Parte ante, *or* Parte post, *as the*
' *Schoolmen have since done.*

Strange Doctrine ! but most welcome to *Atheists* and *Debauchees* ; and farewel to all *Faith* and *Morality*, and to all Religion which consists of them.

If the *Gospel*, which *brought Immortality to Light*, has not plainly and fully declar'd an *Eternity* so much as *à Parte post*, then neither are our *Souls* immortal, nor the *Joys of Heaven*, nor the *Torments of Hell* everlasting ; at least the Light of Nature will not be sufficient to convince the Generality of Mankind of these Truths, since both the Light of Nature, and of the Gospel too added to *it*, has not been effectual (God knows) with too many of the World, in the several Ages of it. But if the Expressions in Scripture of *Eternity à Parte post*, should signify no more than, according to your Construction, a Duration to the *End* of the *Age*, or of the *World*, then the State of good and bad Men will end with it ; and, which is most absurd, the Happiness of the one, and the Misery of the other, will be at an End before the Perfection and Completion thereof will begin ; which will not be till the Day of Judgment, after this World is *dissolv'd*, and *the Elements are melted* 2 Pet. iii.
away with fervent Heat. 12.

Your Reason you give, why the Sacred Writers meddle not with *Eternity*, is, *because it is beyond our Faculties* : Perhaps *Eternity*, *à Parte post*, is not so. Many wicked Men think so little of Death, that one may conclude they fancy an Eternal Duration even upon Earth ; and some ancient Philosophers and modern Atheists have declar'd their Belief, that the *Earth*

will laſt *for ever*, and that *Matter* was *Eternal*, even *à Parte ante*.

P. 35. But if your Reaſon be good, how comes your Scheme of Religion to be form'd? For you own, that the Generation of the Son of God was *in an ineffable Manner*, that is, above our Faculties: Did you find this in the Scriptures? This Part certainly is; but then they meddle beyond our Faculties; and indeed a *Revelation* from Heaven does imply ſomething, which by *Nature* we could not know: But if you do not find the reſt of your Scheme of Religion there, as moſt certainly 'tis not; then you have undertaken a Subject, which the Sacred Writers thought too hard for them; and if your Doctrines be true, then there are ſome Truths, which the Holy Ghoſt, who was John xvi. 13. to *lead us into all Truth* neceſſary to our Salvation, has not diſcover'd to us, but have been reſerv'd for you. *Who can de-* Iſa. liii. 8. *clare his Generation?* ſays the Prophet. It ſeems he did not foreſee that you would undertake to do it, tho' you acknowledge it to be *ineffable*; nay, ſo particularly, as to tell us plainly it was a *Creation*, and even the *very Time* of it, *viz.* a P. 16. 30. *little before* the Creation of the World, when 'Almighty God 'reſolv'd on that great Work, perceiving that* Wiſdom *was neceſ-* P. 26. 'ſary for it, *he preſently* creates *her in* himſelf, or out of his 'Subſtance, *into a* real Being *or* Perſon;' tho' of this you are doubtful; for (as I obſerved before) you cite another Authority, P. 32. 'that it *is was not of the* Unbegotten Subſtance *of the* Fa-'ther, *but was it ſelf* begotten *by the* Divine Power; *and that* 'He *was the* Ancienteſt *of* God's Creatures; *even ſo* ancient, 'that your Author car'd not *to aſſign the* Date *of his* Generation, 'or Creation.

P. 16. But you ſay from *Tertullian* very truly, What other Characteriſtick is there of God, but *Eternity?* And are the Scriptures ſilent in this, without which the *Father* himſelf would not be *God?* Could the Heathen Philoſophers ſpeak of this in ſo *plain* and *lofty* Terms; and did the *Holy Ghoſt* not aſſiſt, but ſo indulge our Weakneſs, as not to ſpeak of it? tho' the moſt important, becauſe the *Foundation*, of all his other *Eſſential Attributes*.

De Iſide & Oſiride, P. 354. *Plutarch* ſays, the Temple of *Iſis* had this Inſcription: (d) 'I *am all that ever* was, *and* is, *and* ſhall be; *and no Mortal has* 'uncover'd *my Veil*.' And tho' we muſt own, that we ſee *darkly*, and *thro' a Veil*, (for who can comprehend the infinite Perfections of God?) yet, that God muſt be *Eternal*, is ſo plain a Truth, that none who truly believ'd a *God*, ever deny'd it.

(d) Ἐγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδεὶς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψεν.

And

And in another Place, he gives a noble and elegant Deſcription of this Eternity; *viz.* (q) 'God, *we muſt ſay*, is, *and* is 'with reſpect to no Time, *but of a* timeleſs, immoveable, *and* 'indeclinable *Age or* Eternity; *of which there is no* Before, *or* 'After, *or* New. *but being* One, *fills a Sempiternity with* one 'Now, *and in this reſpect is* ſolely, really Being, *neither* paſt 'nor future, *neither* Beginning *nor* Ending. περὶ τῦ ὄν, p. 393.

And *Plato* ſays, (r) *We attribute to the* Eternal *Being* was *and* ſhall be, *but not* rightly; *for according to* true *Speech or Reaſon*, *we ſhould aſcribe to him only* Is. And accordingly, in another Place he ſtiles him, τὸ ὄν, *the Being*; which he probably learnt from the *Jews*, and the Writings of *Moſes*, in which God himſelf ſtiles himſelf, *I am*; which ſurely denotes his Eternity: So that it does appear in Scripture, even immediately from God himſelf; and tho' the Manner was above our Faculties, yet the Thing is not ſo; for it was an Anſwer to *Moſes*'s Queſtion, and was to ſatisfy, and it did ſatisfy him and all the *Jews*, to whom he was ſent. In Timæo, p. 37, 38. In Phædro, p. 78. Exod. iii. 13, 14.

But in Support of your Opinion, you ſay, 'the *Greek* Lan- 'guage hath Three Ways of ſpeaking, which are *ſometimes* 'render'd Eternal. p. 28.

The firſt, αἰῶνιος, or περὶ αἰῶνιος, or περὶ αἰώνων, or περὶ χρόνων αἰωνίων.

'This you ſay ſeldom or never ſignifies a proper Eternity.

The Second, ἀΐδιος.

This not always.

The Third, ζωαΐδιος.

This alone always does ſo.

And you add, ''*Tis very remarkable, that the Bible and Apo-* 'ſtolical *Fathers* never in this Caſe of the Antiquity of the 'Son, uſe any but the *Firſt*; *None* of theſe *before* the Council 'of *Nice more* than the *Firſt*, and very rarely the *Second*; while 'Athanaſius and his Followers, and none before them, directly 'ventur'd on the Third Way of ſpeaking, and call'd the *Son* 'Coeternal.

This laſt makes a fair Shew, but indeed is very trifling; for if ἀΐδιος does not ſignify a *proper* Eternity when apply'd to *God*, how can you ſay that ζωαΐδιος always does ſo? For

---

(q) Ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς, χρὴ φάναι, καὶ ἔστι καθ' ἡδέτα χρόνον ἀλλὰ καθ' αἰῶνα τῷ ἀκίνητον καὶ ἀχρόνως καὶ ἀνέγκλιτον καὶ ἢ πρότερον ἢ ὕστερον ἢδέν ὄφιν ἢδ' ὕστερον ἢδὲ νεώτερον, ἀλλ' εἷς ὢν ἐπὶ τῷ νῦν τὸ αἰεὶ πεπλήρωκε καὶ μόνον ὄντι τὸ κατὰ τάδιν ὄντως ὄν, ἀγένητος, ἀδὶ ἐσόμενον ἢδ' ἀπόλλυμενον ἢδὲ παυόμενον.

(r) Τὸ δ' ἦν, τὸ δ' ἔσται, χρόνῳ γενητὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὶδὴ φέροντες, λανθάνομεν ὀρθῶς τὸ ἀΐδιον ἅπαν, καὶ ὀρθῶς, λέγομεν γὰρ δὴ ὡς ἦν, ἔστι τε, καὶ ἔσται, τῆς δὲ τὸ ἔστι μόνον κατὰ τὸν ἀληθῆ λόγον προσήκει.

συγκε-

συναΐδιος, *Coeternal*, is only being with ἀΐδιος, *Eternal*; or being what is ἀΐδιος, *Eternal*.

And there could be no Occaſion to ſtile the Son *Coeternal*, till Hereticks ſubtilly and fraudulently call'd him *God*, and yet deny'd his *Eternity à Parte ante*, which was imply'd in *God*; and therefore to obviate that Fallacy and Equivocation, 'twas requir'd that they ſhould declare him *Coeternal*, that is, as the *Father* is *Eternal*, ſo is the *Son* too. And thus did the *Jews*, to obviate the Hereſy of the *Sadducees*; for when the *Form*, in which they concluded all their Benedictions, *viz. from Age*, was perverted by the *Sadducees* to their Senſe, *viz. of the World*; they appointed the Form to be, *From Age* and *to Age*, that is, *of this World*, and of the *World to come* after the Day of Doom. Now in the Nature and Reaſon of the Thing, if the *Son* be *Eternal*, he muſt be *Coeternal* with the *Father*, that is, *Eternal* as well as the *Father*, neither being before or after the other, but *both* exiſting eternally *together*.

Dr. Hammond *on the New Teſtament*, P.

As to the other two Ways in *Greek* of expreſſing Eternity, I do own, that αἰὼν, and the Derivations from it, do ſometimes in Scripture ſignify the *Age of the World*, and the *Age of the Goſpel*, and πρὸ αἰώνος, *before the World began*: But I am very ſorry the Inference from this Notion, and the Application of it, has been by you deriv'd from ſo ill an Authority or Example, as that of the *Sadducees*, the worſt Sect of all the *Jews*.

I do own alſo, that ἀΐδιος is ſometimes apply'd to *Eternity* only *à Parte poſt*; as in *Jude*, ἀϊδίοις δεσμοῖς, *Everlaſting Chains*:

But that theſe Words do, in Heathen Authors, ſignify a *proper* Eternity when they deſign it, and *Eternity à Parte poſt*, according to the Subject-Matter, I think, cannot be deny'd.

Plato, in the Place before-mention'd, calls God ἀΐδιον ἕσσαν.

De Mundo, *p.* 847, 869.

Ariſtotle, in like manner, uſes δι' αἰῶνος, ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀτέλευτον, to ſignify *Eternity*.

Plutarch: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς αἰώνιος, ἐξ αἰῶνος ὁ θεὸς.

De Pla. Philoſ. *p.* 881.

And if theſe Words do not ſignify a *proper* Eternity, I deſire you to tell me any *Greek* Words, that have been us'd by any *Greek* Authors, to expreſs it.

And that a *proper Eternity* is deſign'd to be ſpoken of in the Scriptures, and that in thoſe Places theſe Words are uſed to expreſs it, and cannot there be underſtood and apply'd to the *Age* of the *Goſpel*, or the *Age* or *Beginning* of the *World*, or *a Time before* the *Beginning* of it; and that theſe Words are apply'd to the *Son*, as well as to the *Father*, I ſhall now ſhew.

P. 28.

'Tis indeed very remarkable, as you ſay, that the *Bible*, 'in the Caſe of the Antiquity of the *Son*, never uſes any but 'the Firſt;' but if it ſhould be ſo, 'twill not be ſubſervient to your Purpoſe, becauſe 'tis as remarkable, that tho' ἀΐδιος

is

is us'd when the *Eternity* of the Father is ſpoken of, *Rom.* i. 20. *Eternal Godhead*; and *Wiſd.* vii. 26. *Eternal Light*; yet *generally*, and *almoſt always*, the Firſt is us'd to expreſs the Eternity of the *Father*, and therefore, if apply'd to the *Son*, it muſt denote alſo *his*, not *Antiquity*, but *Eternity*.

Now whether you have not been too raſh in aſſerting, that the Firſt *ſeldom* or *never* ſignifies a proper Eternity, may be ſeen by ſome few Inſtances of the many which might be produced.

Gen. xxi. 33. The Name of the Lord was there call'd, *The Everlaſting God.*

Iſaiah { xl. 28. / xxvi. 4. } *Everlaſting God.*
Rom. xvi. 26.

Dan. iv. 34. *His Dominion* Everlaſting.
Hab. iii. 6. *His Ways are* Everlaſting.

In all theſe Places αἰῶνι is us'd.

Pſal. { xc. 2. / cvi. 48. } *From everlaſting to everlaſting.* ἀπὸ τ̃ ἀιῶν ἕως τ̃ ἀιῶν.
xli. 13. *From everlaſting to everlaſting.* ἀπὸ τ̃ ἀιῶν εἰς τ̃ ἀιῶνα.
xciii. 2. *Thou art from everlaſting.* ἀπὸ τ̃ ἀιῶν σὺ εἶ.
xxix. 10. *The Lord is King for ever.*
cxix. 89. *For ever thy Word is ſettled in Heaven.*
Deut. xxxii. 40. *I lift up my Hand to Heaven, and ſay, I live for ever.*
Dan. xii. 7. *Sware by him who liveth for ever.* εἰς τ̃ ἀιῶνα.
Rev. iv. 9. *Who liveth for ever and ever.*
1 Pet. v. 11. *To him be Glory — for ever and ever.* εἰς τοὺς ἀιῶνας τ̃ ἀιώνων.
Pſalm x. 16. *The Lord is King for ever and ever.* εἰς τ̃ ἀιῶνα καὶ εἰς τ̃ ἀιῶνα τ̃ ἀιῶν.
Iſaiah lvii. 15. *Who inhabiteth Eternity.* κατοικῶν τ̃ ἀιῶνα.
Pſal. cxlv. 13. *Thy Kingdom is an everlaſting Kingdom.* βασιλεία πάντων αἰώνων.

Now if theſe and many more ſuch Texts ſhould be interpreted of the *Age* of the *World*, or of the *Goſpel*, how unworthy muſt ſuch a Conſtruction be of the Majeſty and Glorious Attributes of God? and indeed how *abſurd*? for then they will run thus:

The God of the *Age*, who inhabits the *Age*.

His

His Power, Dominion, Kingdom and Ways are of the *Age*.

His Word remaineth even in Heaven, but to the *Age*, or *End of the Word*.

Who is to be praiſed from the Beginning of the *Age* to the *End* of the *Age*.

Who from the *Age*, or *Beginning of the World*, is God, or *is*, and lives to the End of the World: So that he begins and ends with the World.

How then is εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας to be tranſlated in the Lord's Prayer? Is the *Kingdom*, the *Power* and the *Glory* of God, to the *Ages* only, or the End of the *World*? And does the Son of God teach us, when we pray, to ſay ſo? St. *Paul* ſays, *the Things which are ſeen are temporal, but the Things which are not ſeen are* αἰώνια, *eternal*; but according to your Notion you muſt render it, are to the *End of the World*, that is, are *temporal*. Is not this abſurd, and turning the Scripture into *Nonſenſe*?

2 Cor. iv. 18.

Could the Heathens happily find an *Eternal Godhead*, and have the inſpir'd Prophets ſpoke of *him* and his *Dominion* as only of this World? Is this the *ſure Word of Prophecy, the Light that ſhines in a dark Place*? And is this Light, and the Light of the Goſpel too, more dim than the Light of Nature and our Reaſon by which we are aſſur'd he muſt be *Infinite* and *Eternal*, or not *God*? And is this Truth not to be mention'd in Scripture, leſt it ſhould dazzle our Eyes, and yet was *reveal'd unto Babes*? why are we *turn'd back to weak and beggarly Rudiments* to learn from *Nature*, and owe to it, our *Faith* of this fundamental Article of all Religion, and deny it to *Revelation*, and the Voice of God himſelf from Heaven, *I am*?

1 Pet. i. 19. Matt. xi. 25. 27. Gal. iv. 9.

But in the Words of our Saviour, *If you had known me, you would have known my Father alſo*, you would certainly have allow'd theſe Expreſſions to have fully denoted an *abſolute* Eternity; (for in the *Greek* Authors they are generally ſo underſtood;) but you apprehend the Conſequence, which is inevitable, that if the ſame Things, and indeed the inſeparable Perfections of God and Eternity be attributed to the *Son*, as well as to the *Father*, then he muſt be *God* equal to the *Father*: But rather than allow *Eternity* to the *Son*, you chuſe (I will not ſay to deny, tho' your Conſtruction of αἰωνιος in the before-mention'd Texts amounts to it, but) to take from us the beſt Evidence we can have, of the *Eternity* of the Father himſelf, which is the Revelation he has given us of himſelf in the Scriptures.

John viii. 19.

I ſhould now mention ſome of the many Texts, which plainly and fully expreſs and declare in the ſame Terms, or equivalent with the above-mention'd, the *Divinity* of our Saviour, his *Eternity*, and other *eſſential incommunicable* Attributes of the Supreme God: But this will be more proper, after I have conſider'd

ſider'd the Texts of Scripture, which you have quoted to ſupport your Doctrine: Which I now proceed to do.

The firſt Text you quote is out of *Proverbs*, which you render thus, *p.* 9. Chap. viii.

The Lord created *me the* Beginning *of his Ways for his Works.* V. 22.

Before the World he founded me, in the Beginning *before he made the Earth.* V. 23.

Before *the Fountains of Water came.* V. 25.

Before *the Mountains were faſtned, he begat me* before *the Hills.* V. 25.

The Word in the *Septuagint* is indeed ἔκτισε, *created*; but Biſhop *Patrick* in his Comment ſays, that according to the *Hebrew* Verity, 'This Text, if it belongs to this Matter, appears 'to have been, as St. *John* ſpeaks, with the Father *in the Be-* 'ginning, being his only Begotten before all Worlds; and ſo 'the *Hebrew* Word, which we tranſlate *poſſeſs*, ſometimes ſig-'nifies in Scripture, and is render'd by the *Septuagint* in ano-'ther Place, *viz. Zech.* iii. 5. ἐγέννησε, *begot.*

I obſerve, that in the 25th Verſe 'tis, *he begat me*, which ſeems to agree with what Biſhop *Patrick* ſays of the Signification of the *Hebrew* Word in the 22d Verſe, and explains what is meant by *created*; not that Created and Begotten are the ſame Thing, as I have ſhewn before out of *Tertullian*, and what I have ſaid upon it.

Beſides, you render, and ſo do our Bibles, the 25th Verſe, he *begat me*; but it ſhould be, *begets me*, γεννᾷ με, in the Preſent Tenſe; and *Origen*'s Obſervation upon it is very juſt, *viz.* 'He *generates me* before the Hills; he did not ſay *begat*, but 'begets, by which Sempiternity is ſignify'd, as *Origen* ſays in another Place cited by you, and of which I have taken notice before, with whom it is *always to-day*; and, as *Plato* ſaid, *Is* is the only proper Term to be uſed of God. 9. Hom. in Jerem. *p.* 106.

And what you render in the 23d Verſe, *before the World*, and our Bibles, *Everlaſting*, the Words are πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος: Of this I have ſpoken already, and ſhewn how improper your Conſtruction is.

But I muſt go back to Biſhop *Patrick*, who ſays indeed, that the Ancient Chriſtians thought that this Text might be apply'd to the *Son* of *God*, the *Eternal Wiſdom*, (and the Authors, which I have here before cited, have done ſo, but very differently from your Conſtruction of them) but he adds, that they were not reſolv'd whether they ought not to be apply'd to him rather in his human Nature; and he delivers his own Opinion, 'that 'Solomon thought of nothing but the wiſe Directions God had 'given them in his Word reveal'd to them by *Moſes* and the 'Prophets.

And really your own following Quotations out of *Eccleſiaſticus*, do confirm Biſhop *Patrick*'s Conſtruction of *Wiſdom* in this Chapter of the *Proverbs*, as I ſhall ſhew; which will alſo be an

Anſwer

Anſwer to them, and be a further Conviction of your unfair Repreſentation of your Quotations, and of your treating your *Texts*, as you have done your *Teſtimonies*.

The Firſt is out of *Eccl.* i. 4. *Wiſdom hath been created before all Things.*

Now it is evident, that this is meant of *Wiſdom*, as it ſignifies the *Grace of God*, or, in Biſhop *Patrick*'s Words, the wiſe Directions given by God; for Verſe 9. ‘ *She is with all Fleſh,* ‘ *according to his Gift, and he hath given her to them that love* ‘ *him:* And Verſe 14. *To fear the Lord is the Beginning of Wiſ-* ‘ *dom, and it was created with the Faithful in the Womb.* And ‘ Verſe 20. *To fear the Lord is call'd the Root of Wiſdom.* Now what can this *Wiſdom* be, but that which *Solomon* had ask'd of God for himſelf, and God had given to him? How can it be apply'd to the *Son* of God, as the *Wiſdom* of God? Is the Fear of God the *Beginning*, the *Root* of him? Was he *created* with the Faithful in the Womb? And Verſe 5. The *Word of God* in the higheſt is the Fountain of *Wiſdom.* Now either the *Word* of *God* here is the *Son of God*, and then Wiſdom muſt neceſſarily be taken in the Senſe which I have mention'd: For the *Word* or *Wiſdom* of God, as denoting the *Son*, can't be the Fountain of the *Wiſdom*, or of the *Son of God*; or if the Word of God be taken for the Directions given by God, *&c.* then *Wiſdom* muſt be underſtood to be the Fruits and Effects thereof, which is the Thing I was to prove.

Μετὰ πᾶσῶν ἐν μίᾳ σωεχπίδη αὐτὶς. 2 Chron. i. 10.

Λόγ Θ.

And this Conſtruction will be further evident by the 24th Chapter, out of which you have taken your next Quotation; and which is introduced by a Quotation, *v.* 7. as ask'd by Wiſdom, which you have omitted: *In whoſe Inheritance ſhall I abide?* And the Anſwer is given, *v.* 8. which you cite in Part: ‘ *Then the Creator of all Things gave me a Commandment,* ‘ *and he that created me caus'd my Tabernacle to reſt* ——— P. 9, 10.

Here you ſtop with a Stroke according to your Cuſtom; for the next Words are an Anſwer to the Queſtion, and would have ſhewn, that your Quotation was not to your Purpoſe: Like him who ask'd, *What is Truth?* and went away without ſtaying for an Anſwer. The Words which follow are: John xviii. 38.

‘ *And ſaid, Let thy Dwelling be in Jacob, and thine Inheritance* ‘ *in Iſrael.* And v. 10. *In the Holy Tabernacle I ſerv'd before him,* ‘ *and ſo was I eſtabliſh'd in Sion, likewiſe in the belov'd City he* ‘ *gave me Reſt.* And v. 23. *All theſe Things are the Book of the* ‘ *Covenant of the moſt High God, even the Law which* Moſes *com-* ‘ *manded for an Heritage unto the Congregations of Jacob.*

Theſe fully explain what *Wiſdom* is ſpoken of in this Chapter, *viz.* That it was the *Law*, and thoſe Divine Inſtructions which God had given more particularly to the *Jews*, and which are ſaid in the Scripture to make them wiſe, and *wiſer than their Enemies*, who had no Knowledge of God's Laws. Pſal. xix. 7. Pſal. cxix. 98.

And

And the 20th Verſe (*My Memorial is ſweeter than Honey, and my Inheritance than the Honey-Comb*) is the ſame as in *Pſal.* xix. 9, 10. *The Judgments of the Lord are ſweeter than Honey and the Honey-Comb.*

And the 18th Verſe, (*I am the Mother of Love, Fear, Knowledge, and holy Hope*) is moſt properly apply'd to *Wiſdom*, as it is the *Grace of God*, and the Divine Aſſiſtance; for it is God's Grace that begets theſe Virtues in us.

But if you will ſtill apply Wiſdom here to the Son of God, then the 18th Verſe ſtiles him ἀϊδιγεννὴς, *Eternal*, or *begotten from Eternity*. And Verſe 36. *He that ſinneth againſt* Me *wrongeth his own Soul.* Surely there is no Sin but againſt God.

There are ſome Paſſages in the *Pſalms* ſo exactly parallel to your Text out of the *Proverbs*, that one would think *Solomon* had learnt and tranſcrib'd them into his *Proverbs* from *Moſes* and *David*, as the Son of *Sirach*, who imitated *Solomon*, did from him.

Pſal. xc. 2. *Before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadſt form'd the Earth and the World*; even *from everlaſting thou art God*; or *from everlaſting to everlaſting thou art.* Ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ.

Now if the Text in the *Proverbs*, *Before the World, before he made the Earth*, and *before the Mountains*, do ſignify the *Beginning* of *Wiſdom*: And *Eccl.* i. 9. *Wiſdom ſhall not fail to the End of the World* (according to your Tranſlation of theſe Texts) then you ought to conſtrue the ſame Expreſſions in the 90th *Pſalm* of the Almighty God in the ſame manner, *viz.* That he did begin but, as *Wiſdom* did, before the World, and ſhall laſt to the End of it; which would be Blaſphemy: And nevertheleſs, to my Aſtoniſhment, you do ſo conſtrue it; for *p.* 6. you cite this *Pſalm*, and render it, from *the Age to the Age*, or from the *Beginning* of the World *to the End* of the World, thou art God.

Pſalm xciii. 2. *The Lord reigneth—the World alſo is eſtabliſh'd, that it cannot be moved.* Ver. 3. *Thy Throne is eſtabliſh'd of* Old; *thou art from* Everlaſting.

If this be apply'd to the Son of God, of whom the *Jews* affirm, (as Biſhop *Patrick* ſays) this was a Prophecy, ſurely this ſufficiently expreſſes *Eternity*; or if it be ſaid of *God* the *Father*, then your Conſtruction of this will be as bad as the former, for the Words are the ſame; or if you let them be underſtood as they ought to be, of the *Eternity* of *God*, you muſt in Juſtice underſtand the Text in the *Proverbs* in like manner of the *Eternity* of the *Son*, if he be meant by *Wiſdom* in that Place. *His Comment.*

Before I diſmiſs your Texts out of the *Proverbs*, I muſt ſay ſomething to the latter Part of the 22d Verſe, *The Beginning of his Ways.*

To

To this it might ſuffice to ſay, that if *the Ways of God are everlaſting*, as is ſaid *Hab.* iii. 6. then the *Beginning* of thoſe Ways muſt be *everlaſting* too; or, to ſpeak more properly, there is *no Beginning* of them. God the Father is ſaid to be *the Beginning and the End:* ſurely this ſignifies his *Eternity*, for you will not ſay he has either; and this is ſaid in the *Revelation* more than once of the Son too. But let us conſider what elſe this Word ἀρχὴ, which you render the *Beginning*, may ſignify in this Place; for to interpret it ſo as to make *Wiſdom*, or the *Son of God*, the *Firſt* of his *Ways*; or, as you mean, of the Creation, and ſo a Part of it, is moſt abſurd, as well as untrue, as I ſhall ſhew by and by.

Ἀρχὴ ſignifies not only *Beginning*, but alſo *Principle*, *Principality*, *Dominion*, *Power*; and in theſe Senſes is us'd in the beſt *Greek* Authors, and in the Bible.

Ariſtotle has wrote a Book, which he entitles, περὶ ἀρχῶν, of or *concerning Principles*; and ſo has *Origen* too.

In Phædro, *p.* 245. And both *Ariſtotle* and *Plato* agree, (x) that ἀρχὴ, 'the 'Principle is unmade; *for by the Principle it is of Neceſſity that* 'every Thing that is made, *be made.*

P. 10. And your Quotation out of *Clem. Alex.* as you your ſelf render it, agrees with this Signification of the Word, 'God who 'made the Beginning *or Principle* of all Things:' And you add, 'Peter *perfectly well underſtood that Expreſſion*, In the Begin-'ning, *or* by the Principle, *God made the Heaven and the* 'Earth.

And ſo is ἀρχὴ by *Juſtin* us'd in your Quotation out of him, if you would have truly rendred that Paſſage.

Why then will you not allow it the ſame Signification in this Text of the *Proverbs*, ſince it perfectly agrees with what you do allow, *viz.* that the World was made by the *Word*, or *Wiſdom* of God; or, in the Words of *Peter* and *Clement*, the *Principle?* And this very Text of the *Proverbs* implies this Conſtruction; for the Concluſion of the Verſe is, εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, *for his Works*; and thus the Two Parts of this Verſe will agree very well, *the Principle of his Ways for his Works*; but then the Conſequence will be, that the *Son* of *God* (if he be meant here by *Wiſdom*, which I think he is not) was not *created*, for the *Principle* is *unmade.*

And why may not even the Word *Beginning* be equivalent to *Principle*; for *Origo*, which ſignifies *Beginning*, is made an *Engliſh* Word, *Origin*, and ſignifies alſo the *Source* or *Spring-head.*

The other Signification of ἀρχὴ, *viz. Principality*, *Dominion*, *Power*, is very proper and applicable to the *Eternal* Wiſdom of

---

(x) Ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἀγένητον· ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ἀνάγκη πᾶν τὸ γενόμενον γίγνεσθαι.

God; for he directs, orders, and governs us, and the whole Creation; as the Prophet says, *The*, or *whose Government* (not whose *Beginning*) *shall be upon his Shoulders*. And so in the following Verse, (not his *Beginning*, but) his *Government* or *Dominion* is great. And thus *Tertullian* expounds both the Signification of the Word ἀρχὴ, and the Application of it: And most certainly the Text in *Deut.* xxxiii. 37. must be so understood, which, as it is in the *Septuagint*, must be render'd, *the* Power *or* Dominion *of God shall cover thee*; for surely you will not translate it, the *Beginning* of God, who has *no* Beginning. And so *Jude* the 6th, ἀρχὴν is render'd in the Margin, *Principality*; and so also *Col.* i. 16. ἀρχαὶ, *Principalities*.

Isa. ix. 6: ἧς ἡ ἀρχὴ: Μεγάλη ἡ ἀρχὴ αὐτῆς: P. 416. §. 19. Adv. Hermog. Σκεπάσει σε θεὸς ἀρχὴ.

There is another Account which may be given of this Text, and is certainly true of the *Son* as the *Wisdom* of God, (tho' I take it from a Book, whose Authority you will not allow, nor I assert) *viz.* He is *the Way that leads to God*; and in this respect he may very properly be the *Beginning* of his Ways, and yet *no created* Being; for surely 'twas this *Wisdom*, this *Logos*, that instructed the Old World, and came at last into it, to shew them *a more excellent Way*; agreeably to this he says, *I am the Way: No Man cometh unto the Father but by me*; and *without* (or *severed*) *from me, ye can do nothing*. And St. *Paul* says, *I can do all Things thro' Christ which strengtheneth me*. And as he is stil'd the *Author of our Faith, and the Captain*, or Leader, *of our Salvation*, (in both Places, ἀρχηγὸς) he may be properly said to be the *Beginning of his Ways, for his Works*: For as we are his Workmanship, so he shews us *the Paths of Life*, and *leads us in the Paths of Righteousness, in the Way everlasting*; and *the Word of God is a Light unto our Paths, that our Footsteps slip not*.

Origen. περὶ ἀρχῶν, p. 672. John xiv. 6. χωρὶς. John xv. 5. Phil. iv. 13. Heb. xii. 2. ii. 10. Psal. xvi. 11. xxiii. 3. cxxxix. 24. cix. 105. xvii. 5.

Upon the whole, as Bishop *Patrick* says, the ancient Fathers thought this Text might be apply'd to the *Son* of *God*; so it was not apply'd to prove him a *Creature*. On the contrary, your *Eusebius*, in the Chapter before cited, when he says that *Solomon* gives us the same Sense, *viz.* that he was *Jehovah*, he immediately cites this Text of the *Proverbs*; surely you will not say, that he first makes *Solomon* assert his *Divinity*, and then quote his Words to prove him a *Creature*. And *Pamphilus* (m) in his Apology for *Origen*, immediately cites this Text, after he had reckon'd into the Number of Hereticks, those who deny'd him to be the *First-begotten*, and the *God* of the *whole* Creation, and the *Word*, and *Wisdom*, which is the *Beginning of his Ways*.

P. 760.

(m) Eos, qui primogenitum eum negant, & totius Creaturæ Deum, & Verbum, & Sapientiam, quæ est initium viarum Dei.

But as positive as you are, that this Text, *Prov.* viii. 22. is a full Proof, that *Wisdom* (which you interpret to be the *Son* of *God*) was *created*; I find, *p.* 35. that you have quoted *Irenæus* for applying this same Text to the *Holy Spirit*; and you, in like manner, infer from thence, that the *Holy Ghost* was *created by God*: I have already shewn, that it is not to be understood of the *Son* of *God*; and you have furnish'd me with Arguments, that it cannot be construed of the *Holy Ghost*; for you make him to be the *Creature* of the *Son of God*, and not immediately of *God* the *Father*; and if you will say, he was the *Creature* of *God* the *Father by* the *Son*, yet how can you make him, as is said, *v.* 22. the *Beginning* of his Ways, or, in your Language, *the First* of the *Creation?* for you say, *p.* 37. he was not of equal Antiquity with the *Son*; nor can there be *Two Firsts*, or *Two Beginnings*, nor could the *Holy Ghost*, the *Creature*, be before his *Creator*, *scil.* the *Son by whom* he was *created.*

That is what I have to offer in Answer to your Three First Texts, *p.* 9. and in some measure to the last out of the *Revelation*, Chap. iii. 14. so far as relates to the Construction of the Word ἀρχὴ; and must be my Excuse for the Length of what I have said upon them.

I come now to your Text, *Col.* i. 15. And, First, to the first Part of it; 'Who is the Image of the *invisible God.*

This Text which is here render'd *Image*, εἰκὼν, and so 2 *Cor.* iv. 4. is in *Heb.* i. 3. χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. The Character of his Subsistence or Person; and the Words immediately preceding are, The *Brightness* (or bright Emanation) of his *Glory*, equivalent to that in *Wisd. Chap.* vii. *v.* 26. of the *Eternal Light.* Now what hath been already said of this *Splendor* and *Emanation* of the *Eternal Light*, may partly explain what is meant by χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, and by εἰκὼν: For it cannot be imagin'd that the first should be inseparable, a necessary *Emanation* from, and the same with, the *Eternal Light*, and yet the very next Words should declare him to be such an Image as is but a Picture, a Representation of it, but in Nature and Essence different from it: And χαρακτὴρ properly signifies the *Impression*, the *Form*; so that in *Him*, I may say, was imprinted the *Godhead*, or, as the Apostle says, *In him* Col. ii. 9. *dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead:* And, as he again says, who being in *the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal* Phil. ii. 6. *with God*; and who can be equal with *God*, or in the *Form* of *God*, but who is *God*, Infinite and Eternal? And that the Apostle so means, is plain by the Expression following, which is apply'd to his *Manhood*; *Taking the Form of a Servant, being made in the Likeness of Man.* So then we must either with the *Gnosticks* deny the Reality of Christ's coming in the Flesh, or we must own, that He, by being in the *Form of God*, was declar'd

'Απαύγασμα.

clar'd by the Apoſtle as *truly* God, and not barely, in your Senſe, the *Image* of God; as by being in the *Form* of a *Servant*, and in the *Likeneſs* of *Man*, He was *really* Man, and not the *Appearance* only of a Man.

And in 2 *Cor.* iv. 4. where 'tis again ſaid, *Who is the Image of God*, 'tis ſaid in the 6th Verſe, *God hath ſhined in our Hearts, to give the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the Face, or rather the Perſon, of Jeſus Chriſt:* For ſo alſo προσωπον ſignifies, and is ſo render'd, *Chap.* ii. 10. And Dr. *Hammond* in his *Commentary* ſays, Chriſt repreſents Almighty God to us, not as a Picture does the Body, but as a real, ſubſtantial Image of him.

And the very next Words in the Text, *Heb.* i. 3. (of which we have been ſpeaking) are, *upholding* all Things by his *Power*, which none can do but *God* who is *Omnipotent*.

I do own, that εἰκων does properly, in the common Acceptation of the Word, ſignify an *Image* or *Picture* of a Thing; but as, I hope, I have ſhewn it does not, it cannot ſo ſignify in the Places aforeſaid; ſo it will be plain, that this Word here muſt ſignify not a *Picture*, but a *full*, *lively* and *perfect Image*. By another Text in this Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, Ch. x. v. 1. '*The Law having a Shadow of good Things to come, and not* '*the very Image* (*or Image it ſelf*) *of the Things*.——Here the *Image* of the Things, muſt ſignify a *full* and *perfect* Image of the Things themſelves; or elſe if Image ſignifies only the *Picture* or *Repreſentation*, 'tis no more than *Shadow*, and then 'tis no *Antitheſis*, which was neceſſary in this Argument of the Apoſtle; nay, 'tis a *Contradiction* in the very ſame Sentence, for it will run thus: The Law having a *Shadow*—and not having the *very* Shadow. οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα.

I come now to the Second Part of your Text, *Col.* i. 15. the *Firſt-born* of every *Creature*, or of the *Creation*, as it is render'd, *Rev.* iii. 14. and cited by you, *p.* 10. from whence you would infer our Saviour to be a *Creature*, tho' the *Firſt-born* and the *Chief* of them. Κτίσεως.

But if you would have added the next Verſe, and what follows, it would manifeſtly have appear'd that he could not be one of them, for it is ſaid;

For by him *were* all *Things* created *that are in* Heaven, *and that are in* Earth, viſible *and* inviſible; *whether they be* Thrones, *or* Dominions, *or* Principalities, *or* Powers; *all Things were created* by *him, and* for *him.* Ver. 16. Ἀρχαὶ.

Hence it will follow, that if *He made* all *Things in Heaven and Earth*, and, as St. *John* adds, that *without him was not* any Thing *made that was made*; ſurely, He *himſelf* was *not* made; for a *Creature* could not make *himſelf*. All Things are *of* God, and *by* God, *Ariſtotle* could ſay: But we need not the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, nor the Sagacity of a Philoſopher; common C. i. 2. χωεις αὐτῶ. Ariſtot de Mundo, p. 858.

common Senſe is ſufficient to inform us, that the *Maker* cannot be a Part of the Things *made*.

Εν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα Κατοικῆσαι. 1 Cor. i. 20. 28. 29.

And the following Verſe would have told you, that he was God; *For it pleaſed the* Father, *that in him ſhould* all Fulneſs *dwell*; *or* all Fulneſs *was pleaſed to dwell in him*; and what that *Fulneſs* is, we ſee in the Second Chapter, *v. 9. all the Fulneſs of the Godhead*: Which Text is introduc'd in a very remarkable Manner, as if the Apoſtle had foreſeen what he ſays in another Place, that *the* Wiſe, *the* Scribe, *the* Diſputer *of this World*, (*to whom the Doctrine concerning* Chriſt, *was Fooliſhneſs*, tho' *he truly was the* Power *of* God, *the* Wiſdom *of* God) might attempt to pervert others from the true Chriſtian Faith. (For, as I obſerv'd before of the *Platoniſts*, *Tertullian* ſays of the Philoſophers in general, that they were *Hæreticorum Patriarchæ*.) He cautions the *Coloſſians* againſt their Inſinuations, in the Verſe immediately preceding; *Beware leſt any Man ſpoil* (or make a Prey of, or enſnare) *you, thro' Philoſophy and vain Deceit, after the Rudiments of this World, and not after Chriſt: For in him dwelleth all the* Fulneſs *of the Godhead bodily*. And Dr. *Hammond* obſerves, that as σῶμα is often loſt in the Genitive Caſe following it; as, σῶμα-μου, *Me*, σῶμα Χριστοῦ, *Chriſt*; ſo here σωματικῶς *Bodily*, may be taken in the ſame Senſe by *Identity* of his very Eſſence.

Adv. Jud. c. 9. p. 142.

Comment. 465.

And I think it is very obſervable, that when in the 15th *Verſe* he had ſtil'd Him the *Firſt-born of every Creature*, the next Verſe begins, *For*, ὅτι, or *becauſe*, *By him were all Things created*, &c. Now if the Apoſtle had meant to aſſert him in the 15th *Verſe* to be a *Creature*, the Reaſon he gives for it, or the Argument he uſes to prove it in the 16th *Verſe*, *viz.* Becauſe *he himſelf created all Things*, is the moſt ſuprizing that ever was urg'd by Man; eſpecially by that Apoſtle, who had aſſerted, that the Creation of the World was a full Proof of the *Eternal Godhead*; and therefore could not now conſiſtently with himſelf make it alſo the Proof of a *Creature*: So that if when he undertook to declare to the *Athenians* the *unknown God*, and *whom they ignorantly worſhipp'd*, the Philoſophers, or even Men of common Senſe had heard him reaſoning in this Manner, they would with Juſtice have cry'd out, *What will this* Babbler *have?*

Rom. i. 20.

Acts xvii. 18.

What I have here before ſaid of the Signification of ἀρχὴ, may ſerve alſo to explain the Meaning of *Firſt-born* in this Text: For tho' the literal and primary Signification of πρωτότοκος be *firſt-born*, yet as *Primogeniture* gives to the Eldeſt a Superiority and Dominion over his Brethren; So in this Senſe it ought to be taken here; and the 18th Verſe of this 1 *Coloſſ.* leads us plainly to it; for 'tis ſaid, *He is the* Head *of the Body the Church, the* Beginning, *the* Firſt-born *from the Dead, that in all Things he might have the* Pre-eminence, *or, more literally, be* Chief.

Πρωτεύων.

So

So 1 *Chron.* xxvi. 10. *Becauſe there was no Eldeſt, his Father made him the* Chief, *or Ruler*; which Privilege did belong to the *Eldeſt*, and which, as ſuch, he might of Right have claim'd. ὅτι οὐκ ἦν πρωτότοκος. Ἄρχοντα.

So when *Iſaac* had made *Jacob Lord* over his Brethren, or of his Brother, *Eſau* complain'd that *Jacob* had ſupplanted him, and taken away his (πρωτοτόκια, Rights of) *Birthright*, and the Bleſſing which appertain'd to it. Gen. xxvii. 29. Τῷ ἀδελφῷ.

And *Pſal.* lxxxix. 27. *I will make him my* Firſt-born, *higher than the Kings of the Earth*; that is, ſays Dr. *Hammond*, *the moſt glorious* of them; for, literally, *David* could not be the *Firſt-born.*

The literal Tranſlation of this Verſe ſeems plainer to this Senſe; *I will place him* (leaving out *my*) *Firſt-born*; that is, ſet him in the Station of the *Firſt-born*, or *Eldeſt*, make him *Chief*, as in the *Chronicles* before-mention'd; or *Lord*, as *Iſaac* did *Jacob.* Καὶ ἐγὼ πρωτότοκον Θήσομαι αὐτὸν.

'Tis ſaid, *Heb.* xii. 23. ye are call'd to *the General Aſſembly* of the Church of the *Firſt born*: Muſt this be conſtrued literally of the Church of the *Firſt-born*, or *Eldeſt*, as 'tis in the 78th *Pſalm*, v. 51. *he ſmote all the* Firſt-born *in Egypt*? No, ſurely; this is meant, and ſo Dr. *Hammond* expounds it, of the *Apoſtles* and *firſt Converts* to Chriſtianity; and ſo *Epenetus* is call'd the *firſt-Fruits* of *Achaia*, thoſe who had the *firſt-Fruits* of the Spirit. Rom. xvi. 5. viii. 23.

And St. *Paul* tells us, another Title our Saviour had to this Appellation of *Firſt-born*, viz. *Whom he did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate to be conform'd to the Image of his Son, that he might be the* Firſt-born *among many Brethren*: Or, as he is ſtil'd, *Heb.* ii. 10. in Terms equivalent, *the Captain of their Salvation, whom*, v. 11. *he was not aſham'd to call Brethren*; or, as it is *Heb.* xii. 2. *the Author and Finiſher of their Faith.* Rom. viii. 29. Ἀρχηγὸς. Ἀρχηγὸς.

To conclude this Point; ſurely there are many figurative Expreſſions, which it would be abſurd to conſtrue literally; *I am the Vine*; *This is my Body*, &c. Nay, ſome Things, which are ſaid of Men, cannot be ſo taken neither; a *new Creature, created in Chriſt unto good Works, born again*, &c. Shall we ſay, like *Nicodemus*, *Can a Man enter the ſecond Time into his Mother's Womb?* To which, and to all ſuch Conſtructions, there needs no other Anſwer than what our Saviour gave to him, *Art thou a Maſter of Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe Things?* John iii. 10.

There remains but one Text more which you have cited, *viz.* Heb. iii. 2. *Who was faithful to him*

that, { in our Tranſlation, *appointed* / in your Tranſlation, *made* } *him.* ποιήσαντι. P. 31.

And you ſay, ‘ that *the Author to the* Hebrews *directly affirms*, ‘ *That* God made Chriſt, *which in the 4th Century was reckon'd ſo* ‘ *Heterodox, that this Epiſtle was in ſome Places ſeldom read in* ‘ *Publick*; *and that partly out of the Dread of ſuch an Expreſſion*; as *Philaſtrius* aſſures.

I have not that Book, ſo I can't trace you in this Quoration: But I wonder that it was poſſible for any Man to dread this Expreſſion or Text; for I will, with great Aſſurance, affirm, That the Apoſtle does not ſay that God *made* Chriſt in your Senſe, or in any Senſe, that even an *Athanaſian* (as you term us) will not acknowledge with *Joy*, and with *a full Aſſurance* of Faith: But that you ſhould ſo tranſlate and apply this Text to prove the Son of God a *Creature*, and charge the Apoſtle with aſſerting it expreſsly, I would not have believ'd from any Man but your ſelf; for ſurely never was any Part of the Scripture ſo perverted and diſtorted to ſerve a Turn.

I do agree that ποιέω does ſignify to *make* in your Senſe, and you cannot deny that it alſo ſignifies to *appoint* or *conſtitute*; and that it is ſo us'd ſometimes in Scripture.

1 Chron. xxvi. 10.

His Father { *made him Chief.* / Ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἄρχοντα.

Rev. i. 6.

{ *Hath made us Kings and Prieſts.* / Ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς.

Mark iii. 14. { *He* ordained *Twelve.* / Ἐποίησεν δώδεκα.

Hebr. v. 5.

Chriſt glorify'd not himſelf { *to be* made *an High Prieſt.* / Γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα.

Which Word γενηθῆναι more ſtrongly denotes *making* in your Senſe, than ποίησεν; and yet ſurely no Man will make ſo ridiculous a Conſtruction of any of the Texrs, as to call them *Creations*, as you would have this 3d *Hebr.* to be underſtood; which plainly ſignifies no more than *appointing*, or, if you pleaſe, *making* him our *High-Prieſt*; as will be moſt evident.

This Third Chapter begins thus.

Wherefore, holy Brethren, conſider the Apoſtle and High-Prieſt of our Profeſſion Chriſt Jeſus, who was Faithful to him that

{ *appointed* / made } *him.*

Wherefore denotes an Inference from ſome Premiſſes, and ſo leads to the Context, and the foregoing Verſes at the End of the ſecond Chapter, *viz.*

Ver. 14. *Foraſmuch then as Children are Partakers of Fleſh and Blood, he alſo himſelf took Part of the ſame, that thro' Death he might deſtroy him, that had the Power of Death, that is, the Devil.*

For

For—*he took on him the Seed of Abraham.* Ver. 16,

Wherefore in all Things it behov'd him to be made *like unto his Brethren, that he might be a* merciful *and* faithful High-Prieſt, *in Things pertaining to God, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People.* 17.

For in that he himſelf hath ſuffered being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted. 18.

Then follows the Third Chapter, *Wherefore, holy Brethren,* &c. as above.

You may ſee that the whole Diſcourſe of the Apoſtle relates to his human Nature; *He took upon him Fleſh and Blood, and in all Things was made like unto his Brethren*; and the Reaſon given for it is, *That he might be a merciful and faithful High Prieſt in Things pertaining to God*; and then to offer up himſelf a Sacrifice *to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People*: Was it not in this Reſpect, *as Man*, that he died?- For, ſurely, 'tis Blaſphemy to ſay, that his Godhead dy'd; and yet I know not how you can avoid it, if you apply your Text to his *Divine Nature*. Was it not, *as Man*, that he became our *High-Prieſt?* Do not you argue from thence againſt *Polycarp*'s and *Juſtin*'s P. 25. calling him *Eternal* High-Prieſt? Was it not the *High-Prieſt* that was *faithful?* If then he that was *faithful* was the *High-Prieſt*; if the *High-Prieſt* was he that dy'd for us; and in order to it, *took our Fleſh and Blood*, and *became Man*, then it was *as ſuch*, viz. *as Man*, that the Apoſtle ſays he was *made* and *conſtituted* High-Prieſt, who, as St. *Paul* ſays, *ever liveth to make Interceſſion for us.* Heb. vii. 25.

I muſt alſo take Notice that he is here ſtil'd Apoſtle too, or as the Word ſignifies, *Meſſenger*: Now he was that Meſſenger *as Man, to bring us the glad Tidings of Salvation*, and to teach us an holy Religion, by which we might obtain it: So that he who was *made* or *conſtituted* an Apoſtle and High-Prieſt, may alſo be ſaid to be *made*, becauſe both as an *Apoſtle* and *High-Prieſt* he was *Man*, and was therefore *made Man*, that he might be *Both.*

I have now gone thro' and examin'd your Texts and your Teſtimonies; and, I hope, have ſhewn that the *One* are either not applicable to your Purpoſe, or very ſhort of proving what you aim at: And for the *Other*, I am very ſorry I muſt ſay you have very groſsly corrupted your Witneſſes: Such Evidence is enough to ſpoil even a good Cauſe; but I muſt own it is very proper for a bad one, which with ſuch only can, with any Colour, be ſupported: Nevertheleſs you do, in a very pompous Manner, ſum up your Evidence; but I can't be convinc'd by it; for your *Premiſſes* do not warrant your *Concluſion*, nor *ought I to be carried about and toſs'd to and fro with every Wind of Doctrine by the Sleight of Men*; and this Advice is repeated, *Heb.* 13. where after the Apoſtle had in the 8th *Verſe* told us, that Jeſus Chriſt *was the ſame Yeſterday, and to* Gal. iv. 14.

Day, and for ever; he adds in the 9th Verſe, *be not carried about with ſtrange Doctrines*; and *Rom.* xiii. 17. he prays us to *beware of them that cauſe Diviſions and Offences contrary to the Doctrine we have learnt.* And indeed I wonder that the Proofs, which you have produced, could pervert you from the Faith into which you were baptiz'd: But the *Spirit expreſsly ſpeaketh, that in the latter Times ſome ſhall depart from the Faith*; and the laſt Verſe of the preceding Chapter tells us, what that Faith was, *viz. The great Myſtery of Godlineſs*, God *manifeſted in the Fleſh.* But they who had their Denomination from a Pretence of greater Knowledge and clearer Inſight into the Myſteries of the Chriſtian Religion than others, were the Men, who moſt corrupted the Doctrines of it by their ſtrange Opinions; and they were the *unſtable who wreſted* (or perverted, or deprav'd) *the Scriptures*, which ſurely are *profitable for Doctrine and Inſtruction*: And 'tis a terrible Threatning pronounced by *David* to the Adverſaries of Chriſt, and repeated by St. *Paul*, *Let their Eyes be darkned that they ſee not*; *and let that which ſhould have been for their Welfare, become a Stumbling-block, and Occaſion of their Falling*, and *their Recompence.*

1 Tim. iv. 1.

2 Pet. iii. 16.

Σκάνδαλον.

2 Tim. iv. 16.

Pſal. lxix. 19.

Rom. xi. 9.

Σκάνδαλον.

ἀνταπόδομα.

In ſtating the Texts and Teſtimonies on both Sides, you have begun with the Texts cited by Mr. *Seaton*, and have mention'd moſt, but not all of them: And you have thought it a ſufficient Anſwer to inſert your Interpretation of the Terms *Eternal*, *Eternity*, by the Words *Age* and the *World*, of which I have already ſaid what occurr'd to me.

You have alſo, with a ſeeming Generoſity, added ſome Teſtimonies from the Fathers, in which alſo you inſert your Conſtruction of *Eternity*, and very remarkably in the 8th and 9th Pages your Author calls Chriſt's Generation ἄναρχον, *Beginningleſs*; and you help us to underſtand, according to your Notion, but contrary to the Signification of the Word, His Generation *Only* before the Beginning of the World.

Then you ſum up all by ſaying,

P. 9. ‘ *Theſe Paſſages out of* Euſebius, *&c. bid the faireſt for a real* ‘ *Eternity of the Son*; yet 'tis plain from other Paſſages, that ‘ all of them were utterly againſt a proper *Eternity* of *the Son*, ‘ as we ſhall ſee hereafter.

By which laſt Words I ſuppoſe you mean your Quotations on the other Side. Theſe I have examin'd, and will, with ſome Confidence, affirm, that you have by no Means made good your Aſſertion; and ſince you ſay, that, ‘ *theſe are the*

P. 24. ‘ *principal Original Texts and Teſtimonies which concern the important Subject before us*,' I might venture to leave the Matter here, and ſay to you, in your own Words, *p.* 37. *If you will ſoberly review* only your own *Evidence*, and ſtate it fairly, without putting Words into your Witneſſes Mouths, *and* make *a juſt* Conſtruction of your Quotations: I might *appeal to you, ſuppoſing you had no Biaſs*, Whether you can in *Conſcience* perſiſt

in

in the Opinion that our Saviour is but a *Creature*, ſo *contrary to the* Original *Chriſtian Religion?* Nay, I will add, ſo contrary to all the Predictions of the *Prophets*, the Interpretation of many Texts by the *Learned Jews* themſelves, and the Expectation of the *Jewiſh Nation* of what their *Meſſiah* was to be, *viz.* the *Word* of *God*, the *Son* of *God*, *God equal* with the *Father*. And for this I have the Authority of your great *Euſebius*, which I have already cited, (whom you ſay *none of the Learned will any more pretend that he was an* Athanaſian; and therefore he can't be charg'd by you with Partiality to our Doctrine:) He ſays, that the *Hebrew* Oracles ſtile him the *Word* of *God*, *God* of *God*, as we Chriſtians are taught to ſpeak of him; and for Proof quotes ſome Paſſages out of *Moſes* and *David*, and that the *Jews* applied to him even the *incommunicable Name* Jehovah: And I hope by further Evidence and full Proofs to make good the following Propoſitions, which comprehend what I have to ſay upon this Subject. P. 33.

1. That many Paſſages in the Old Teſtament, which were ſpoken as of *God*, were interpreted by the Learned *Jews* themſelves of the *Word* of *God* in the *higheſt* Senſe; notwithſtanding what you ſay, *p.* 25. (without producing any Evidence for it) '*that the ancient Chriſtians never look'd upon them as true of the* '*Son himſelf, but of the Father only.*

2. That the *Predictions* of the *Meſſiah* make him to be *Eternal God.*

3. That the *Jews* had *this* Notion of their *Meſſiah.*

4. That the Scriptures of the *New Teſtament* expreſsly declare him to be ſo.

Which when I have done, I hope I ſhall free my ſelf from your Suſpicion which you inſinuate, that *I have a Biaſs* in this Queſtion, meaning, I preſume, the Prejudice of Education; for which, indeed, I daily bleſs the good Providence of God, and hope by his Grace ſhall never caſt off that *firſt* Faith, but rather be ſtrengthen'd in it by that *Holy Spirit*, which hath furniſh'd to me in the Scriptures, and enabled me in ſome Meaſure to give, many Reaſons for it. P. 38.

Tho' I may ſay, as in Controverſies at Law, he that will ſue me for my Poſſeſſion, muſt firſt make out his own Title, before I need produce any Evidence for mine; ſo ſince we are in Poſſeſſion of this Doctrine for which I contend, and this Poſſeſſion has been for 1700 Years, therefore till you have made appear the Truth of yours, by better Proofs than you have hitherto produced, which yet you ſay are the *beſt* you have, there can be no great Occaſion, much leſs have you any Right to demand of me, to confirm, by any Teſtimonies, our Confeſſion of that Faith, on which Chriſt has *founded his Church, againſt which the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail.*

But

P. 24. But before I proceed, I desire to say something to the Claim you make to the *Septuagint* Version, from whence, you say, Christ and his Apostles *always* quoted the Old Testament.

That their Quotations were generally from the *Septuagint* Translation, I do not deny; much less will I deny the Authority of that Translation, especially of those Places referred to in those Quotations: But that their Quotations were *always* out of that Translation, I believe, when you think again, you will not so peremptorily assert, because there are Instances to the *contrary*.

And you cannot deny, but that 'tis only a *Translation*, and therefore cannot be more authentick than the *Original Hebrew*, nay, as the Author of the Prologue to *Ecclesiasticus* says, 'it 'must *come short of some Words*; *for the same Things utter'd in* 'Hebrew, *and translated into another Language, have not the* 'same *Force in them*; *and not only these Things, but the Law and* 'the *Prophets* (*or Prophecies*) *have no small Difference when they* 'are *spoken in their own Language.* And I will add, that there is *one* very material Word in *Hebrew*, which cannot be express'd by any Word in any other Language; and as there are *Idioms* in every Language, so the Translation must be understood in that Sense in which the Original is taken; and tho' our *Saviour* quoted the *Greek* Version, yet he did not speak in the *Greek* Tongue; and the *Jews* took what he said, in the Sense in which they understand their own Text, as will be manifest by and by: And the Apostles who had the Gift of Tongues, deliver'd their Doctrines, which they receiv'd from him, in plain Words, such as their Hearers understood, and as fully as the Mysteries of our Salvation could be express'd; and there may be very good Reason why our Saviour and they chuse to refer to the *Septuagint*, to wit, because the *Greek* was then the most *common* Language, and which even the *Jews* themselves by their Dispersion had learnt, and many of them had obtain'd the Name of *Greeks* or *Hellenists*, and us'd the *Septuagint* Translation; and since the *Gentile* World, as well as the *Jews*, were to be converted to the *Faith* in *Christ*, it was proper to refer them to the Writings of *Moses* and the *Prophets which* John v. 39. *testify'd of him*, in the Language which they understood. But surely this was not setting aside the *Hebrew* Bible; for if the 2 Tim. iii. 16. Scriptures were *given by Inspiration of God, and holy Men of God spake as they were mov'd by the Holy Ghost*; then surely those who originally writ in *Hebrew*, were at least as much inspir'd as the LXXII Translators of their Writings; nay, if the LXXII had been enabled by the Holy Spirit to translate exactly and literally, yet if what was so translated was not written by *Inspiration*, the Translation, tho' made by *Inspiration*, could not make it to be of *Divine Authority*.

I do

I do not ſay this, that I pretend to the leaſt Knowledge of the *Hebrew* Tongue; but I have learnt ſome Things from Authors who did, which I may have had, and may have Occaſion to mention in what follows.

And ſo I proceed to my Propoſitions.

Firſt, That many Paſſages in the Old Teſtament, which were ſpoken as of God, were interpreted by the Learned *Jews* of the Word of God in the higheſt Senſe.

The Lord *ſaid.*	———	*The* Word *of the Lord ſaid.*	Deut. 34. 4.
Whom the Lord *knew Face to Face.*	Arab. *Verſion.* *Deus* allocutus eſt eum ſine medio.	*Who knew the* Word *of the Lord talking with him.*	10.
Moſes went up unto God.	Arab. *Verſion.* Ad *Angelum* Dei. *And this is ſo intrepreted by St.* Stephen, Acts 7. 38.	*Moſes went up into the Preſence of the* Word *of God.*	Exo. 19. 3.
I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between Me *and Thee.*	———	*I will eſtabliſh my Covenant between my* Word *and Thee.*	17. 7.
If God *will be with me, then ſhall the* Lord *be my God.*	Chald. Paraph.	*If the* Word *of the Lord be with me, then the* Word *of the Lord ſhall be my God.*	Gen. 28. 20, 21.
I am He, *and there is no* God *beſides* me. *I kill*, &c.	Chald. Paraph. Servus meus *Chriſtus* quem elegi.	*The* Word *of the Lord ſaid, I am* He, *who* was, *and* is, *and* is to come, *and there is no other* God *beſides me. I kill*, &c.	Deu. 32. 39 Iſa. 43. 10.

And many more, which you will find in Dr. *Hammond*'s Comment on the New Teſtament, and in Biſhop *Patrick* and Biſhop *Kidder*.

I find in *Ezek.* i. 24. *As the Voice of the* Almighty: This is omitted in the common Impreſſions of the *Septuagint* Bible, but ought to be inſerted; for in the *Polyglot* Bible, I find it in the *Hebrew*, *Chaldee* Paraphraſe, *Syriac* and *Arabick*, *Vocem* Saddai, *velut vocem omnipotentis*, *vocem* Domini *quaſi vocem* Dei potentiſſimi ſufficientiſſimi, Theodoret: ὡς φωνὴν θεοῦ σαδδαὶ;

and

and in ſome Copies ὡς φωνὴν θεοῦ σαδδαὶ ἱκανοῦ: which according to the *Septuagint* is, φωνὴν τοῦ λόγου: So that what in the above-mention'd Places was in the Original, *God*, and ſo render'd by the LXXII, but render'd as above, *the Word* of God; here in this Paſſage in *Ezek.* which is in all the Languages render'd *God Almighty*, is according to the LXXII, the Voice of the λόγος, the *Word* of God.

I preſume it will not be deny'd, that by the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, and the *Angel* of *his Preſence*, the *Meſſiah* was underſtood by the *Jews*, and now alſo by all Chriſtians: Let us ſee then what is ſaid of this *Angel*.

Exod. iii. 2. Κύριος καὶ ἔξοχὴν. Θεὸς. Exod. xxiii. 20, 21.

'*The* Angel *of* the Lord *appeared unto* Moſes *in a Flame of Fire out of the Buſh*: And in the 4th Verſe, he is ſtil'd, *God* (the *Lord*) and in the 6th Verſe he ſays, *I am the* God *of* thy Father, *the* God *of* Abraham.

Behold I ſend an (μου my) Angel *before thee*——*Obey his Voice, for he will not pardon your Tranſgreſſions*; *for* my Name *is in him*, that is, *he is* God: For *my* Name implies and ſignifies *Eſſence*, as *Deut.* xxviii. 58. *That thou may'ſt fear this glorious and fearful* Name, the Lord thy God. And ſo *Pſal.* xx. 1. The Name *of the God of Jacob defend thee*, that is, *God* defend thee; for the *Name of God* was not like an Amulet, or Charm, as ſome ſuperſtitious *Jews* uſed their Phylacteries, to keep them from Hurt. And ſo expreſly, *Exod.* iii. 13. *What is his Name?* v. 14. *I am that I am.* And ſo our Saviour ſays, *John* xiv. 11. *I am in the* Father, *and the* Father in me; and, *who can forgive Sins but* God? *Mark* ii. 7.

Bp. Kidder.

And *Maimonides* explains this Text to be meant of the *Prophet*, Deut. xviii. 15. that was to be rais'd like unto *Moſes*; and *Malachi* calls him the *Meſſenger of the Covenant*, Chap. iii. 1. and St. *Paul* ſays, 1 *Cor.* x. 9. and *Heb.* iii. 9. it was *Chriſt*, *who was tempted in the Wilderneſs.*

Gen. xviii. 2.

Of the Angels which appeared to *Abraham*, one was the *Angel* of the *Covenant*, and he is all along ſtil'd *the Lord*; and in the 1ſt Verſe, the LXXII. render *the Lord*, ὁ θεὸς, God.

Exodus xxxiii. 14. Αὐτὸς προπορεύσομαί σοῦ

My Preſence ſhall go with thee, (ſays God to *Moſes*, in Anſwer to him, who, v. 12. had ſaid, *Thou haſt not let me know whom thou wilt ſend with me*; and this is render'd by the LXXII, *I my ſelf*, (God) *will go before thee.*

Iſa. lxiii. 9. Ὁ πρεσβὺς οὐδὲ ἄγγελος ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἔσωσεν αὐτούς.

The Angel of his Preſence ſaved them: This the LXXII render very elegantly, not *a Meſſenger*, nor *an Angel*, *but he* (*God*) *himſelf ſaved them.*

How is it poſſible to interpret *this* eſpecially, (or indeed any of the foregoing Texts) as of a Perſon repreſenting and perſonating the Father, (as you ſay *p.* 25.) in ſpight of even the negative Words, *not* a *Meſſenger*, *not* an *Angel*, but *he himſelf?*

I ſhall mention but one more, and that is *Gen.* xxii. The Command to *Abraham* to ſacrifice *Iſaac* was from *God.* v. 1. and v. 11. *The Angel of the Lord call'd to him out of Heaven*; *and*, v. 12.

v. 12. *ſaid, Lay not thy Hand upon the Lad ; for now I know that thou feareſt* God, *ſeeing that thou haſt not with-held thy Son from* Me. This muſt be the *Angel* of the *Covenant*; for the not withholding his Son from *Me*, muſt be from *him* who *v.* 1. gave him the Command, and whom by ſo doing he ſhew'd that he fear'd, *viz. God.* And v. 14. *The* Angel *of the* Lord *call'd to Abraham a ſecond time, and ſaid, By* My ſelf *have* I ſworn, *&c.* And the Apoſtle, *Heb.* vi. 13. gives the Reaſon of it, *viz.* becauſe he could ſwear by *no greater* than himſelf ; and therefore *he*, this *Angel* of the *Covenant*, muſt be equal with the *Supreme God*: And ſo *Abraham*, v. 14. calls the Name of that Place by the Name of the Supreme *God*, *Jehovah-jireh.*

Secondly, The *Predictions* of the *Meſſiah* make him to be *Eternal* God.

I think we are agreed, that there is *no God* beſides the *Lord*, and that he will not give his *Glory unto another* ; for *before me*, ſays God, *was no God form'd, neither ſhall be after me* ; *I, even I am the Lord, and beſides me there is no Saviour*: If then I can ſhew, that the *incommunicable Name* of God is given to the *Meſſiah*, that he is ſtil'd the *Lord* and *God*, and that the *Eſſential Attributes* of *God* are *prædicated* of him, I ſhall ſufficiently make good my Propoſition. Iſa. xlv. 5. xlii. 8. xliii. 10. 11.

Some of the Texts which I have mention'd under my Firſt Head, are alſo Proofs of this Second, and having had Occaſion to mention others in this Letter, and ſeveral having been cited by Mr. *Seaton*, I ſhall here take notice but of ſome few more.

God ſaid, *Let us make Man*, &c. *Juſtin Martyr* urges this to *Trypho* to the ſame Purpoſe for which I now cite it, and treats the *Jews* Anſwers to it very contemptuouſly, as I obſerv'd before ; and Biſhop *Patrick* quotes *Epiphanius* for ſaying, that this was underſtood by all the ancient Chriſtians to denote a *Plurality of Perſons* in the *Deity* ; and that the *Jews*, who would evade it, do it in a moſt ridiculous Manner, and therefore no Chriſtian ſhould imitate them; nor ſhould you contradict your *Euſebius*, and your own Quotation, *p.* 35. out of *Irenæus*: The *firſt* ſays in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſt.* p. 6. that the Words in this Text of *Geneſis*, were ſpoken to *Chriſt* ; and the *laſt* ſays they were ſpoken to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*. And this Conſtruction of this Text is very well ſupported by St. *John* i. 3. *All Things were made by him, and without him* (χωρὶς αὐτοῦ, *ſeparately from him*) *was not any Thing made* ; therefore *not* as the *Inſtrument* which the Father us'd in creating all Things, but as *united* with him in that Act of *Omnipotence* ; and therefore he was *God equally* with the *Father*, who wanted not the Help of a *Creature* to exert his Power, or to eaſe him, as of a Burden, in exerciſing it ; and as it is ſaid, *Rev.* iv. 11. of Almighty God, *Thou haſt created all Things*, and for thy Pleaſure *they are and* Gen. i. 26.

were

were created; ſo it is ſaid alſo of the Son, *Col.* i. 16. *All Things were created by him and* for *him.*

Iſa. xl. 9. *Say unto the Cities of* Judah, *Behold your* God: The whole Context ſhews that this was ſpoken of the *Meſſiah*; as is alſo,

Iſa. liv. 5. *Thy* Maker *is thy Husband, the* Lord of Hoſts *is his Name; and thy Meſſenger the* Holy One *of* Iſrael; *the* God *of the* whole Earth *ſhall he be called.*

Exod. 6. 3. *I appeared to Abraham* ——— *by the Name of* God Almighty: *but by my Name* Jehovah *was I not known to him.*

It is to be obſerv'd, that *Jehovah* is here, and in other Places of Scripture, render'd by the LXXII, κύριος, the *Lord*; ſo that where κύριος, the *Lord*, is apply'd in the Old Teſtament to the *Meſſiah*, it ought to be taken in the higheſt Senſe, or elſe the LXXII ſhould have found ſome other Way of expreſſing *Jehovah*, ſince there is no one Word in any Language that comes up to the full Signification of it; for it denotes the *Eſſence* of God, *viz.* that *is*, *was*, and *is to come*; and is ſo peculiar to the *Great God*, (as in *Pſal.* lxxxiii. 18. *whoſe Name* alone *is* Jehovah) that the *Jews*, out of a ſuperſtitious Reverence, think it unlawful to pronounce it.

In the Septuagint, κύριος.

But this holy *Name* is apply'd to the *Meſſiah*, and therefore he muſt be *God.*

Jer. xxiii. 6. Τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὃ καλέσει αὐτὸν κύριος Ἰωσεδὲκ ὁν τρόπον. *This is the Name by which he ſhall be called, The* Lord, *or* Jehovah, *our* Righteouſneſs: In the *Septuagint* 'tis, *Joſedec among the Prophets.* This cannot be properly a Name, for it is not given to the *Meſſiah* in the Old and New Teſtament: ſo it muſt be underſtood according to the Signification of the Word; as *Immanuel*, in St. *Matth.* i. and *Iſa.* vii. 14. was not literally the Name of our Saviour, but to denote what he was, *God with us*; and in like manner, as *Jehovah*, to avoid pronouncing the Word it ſelf was ſometimes pronounced ἰαὼ and *Sedec*, ſignifying in *Hebrew*, *Juſtice* or *Righteouſneſs*; Ἰωσεδὲκ is as much as to ſay, *Jehovah our Righteouſneſs.*

Jer. xiii. 16. And ſo he again is ſtil'd, *The Lord* (and in the Margin, *Jehovah*) *our Righteouſneſs:* This is left out of the *Septuagint*, as is all in that Chapter from the 13th Verſe excluſive.

In theſe Chapters he is alſo call'd, *The Righteous Branch, the Branch of Righteouſneſs*; which in the *Septuagint* is ἀνατολὴ, as alſo in *Luke* i. 78. and render'd, *The Day-ſpring*; ſuitable whereunto they alſo tranſlate *Iſa.* iv. .. (which in our Bibles is, *The Branch of the Lord ſhall be beautiful and glorious*) ὀπὶ λάμψει, *ſhall ſhine*: And what this *Branch*, or *Day-ſpring* was, the LXXII tell us, *viz. God*; for the Words in their Tranſlation are, ὀπὶ λάμψει ὁ θεὸς, God *ſhall ſhine.*

Thirdly, The *Jews* had this Notion of their *Meſſiah*, That he was to be the *Son of God*, and as ſuch, *equal* with God.

Now

Now if the Prophecies amount to this, (as they do) then I might conclude, that they who believ'd their Prophets, muſt have had this Notion: But it will appear very plainly Fact; for

When the High Prieſt had ſolemnly adjur'd our Saviour, *Matt.* xxvi. 63. *Tell us whether thou be the* Chriſt *the* Son of God? This very Queſtion implies, that they expected the *Son of God* to be their *Chriſt*, or *Meſſiah*; but further, he anſwer'd, *Thou haſt ſaid*, or as St. *Mark* relates it, c. xiv. 61. *I am*; *hereafter ye ſhall ſee* the Son of Man *ſitting on the Right Hand of Power*, &c. (that is, *judging the World*,) as he ſays, *Matt.* xvi. 21. and Ch. xxiv. 30, 31. which was underſtood by the *Jews* to be the Office of the *Son of God*, as is plain by *Luke* xxii. 69, 70. for upon his ſaying, *Hereafter ſhall the Son of Man ſit on the Right Hand of the Power of God*: *Then ſaid all, art thou then the* Son *of God?* Upon this Anſwer of our Saviour, the High Prieſt cries out, *He hath ſpoken Blaſphemy*; which could not be, unleſs what he had ſaid were an Aſſertion of his being *God*; and the *Jews* told *Pilate*, *John* xix. 7. *We have a Law, and by that Law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf the* Son of God, *i. e.* God, or elſe they had no ſuch Law.

The aboveſaid Queſtion of the High Prieſt ſhews, as I have ſaid, the Opinion they had of their *Meſſiah*; which is yet plainer, as it is related by St. *Luke*, Ch. xxii. 67. where the Queſtion is put ſingly, *Art thou the* Chriſt? And upon our Saviour's Anſwer, they make the Inference by their Second Queſtion, *Art thou then the* Son of God?

And that they underſtood that the *Son* of God was God *equal* to God, is plain by *John* v. 18. *The Jews ſought to kill him, becauſe he ſaid*, God *was his* Father, *making himſelf equal with God.* And ſo again, *John* x. 30, 33. he calling *God* his *Father*, they would have ſtoned him, *becauſe thou being a* Man, *makeſt thyſelf* God.

So *John* i. 45. When *Philip* had told *Nathanael*, that he had found him of whom *Moſes* and the Prophets had wrote, and *Nathanael* being convinced of it, cries out, *Thou art the* Son of God.

And ſo ſaid *Martha*, *John* xi. 27. 'Thou art *Chriſt* the *Son* 'of *God*, which ſhould come into the World.

And ſo ſaid St. *Peter*, Matt. xvi. 16. and *John* vi. 69. 'Thou 'art *Chriſt*, the *Son* of the *Living God.* Upon which our Saviour commands them, at the 20th Ver. to tell no Man that he was Jeſus the *Chriſt*, or *Meſſiah*; which ſhews that the *Son of God* and *Meſſiah*, were Characters (in the Opinion of the *Jews*, from the higheſt to the loweſt) denoting the ſame Perſon under different Reſpects, which our Saviour thus confirms; and further, he tells Peter, 1ſt, that it '*was his Father which is in Heaven, who had reveal'd this to him*; and 2dly, That 'upon 'this *Rock*, (*viz.* this Confeſſion of Faith) *he would build his*

'*Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* And therefore let them, who deny this Faith, take care that they are not undermining this *Rock*, this *Church of God*, and *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, *againſt which all the Powers of Darkneſs ſhall not prevail*, leſt they be *found to fight againſt God.* And further, as our Saviour ſays, *John* viii. 24. *If ye believe not that* I *am* he, *(or* I am *) ye ſhall die in your Sins*: A dreadful Threatning, and ſhould be conſidered by every Man.

Acts v. 39.

The very Objections which the *Jews* made to our Saviour, imply this their Opinion of the Meſſiah: For, ſay they, *John* vii. 27. *When* Chriſt *cometh, no Man knoweth whence he is*; that, is, in the Words of *Iſa.* liii. 8. *Who can declare his Generation?* which is ſpoke of the *Meſſiah.* And ſo, *Acts* viii. 33. *Philip* expounds it to the *Eunuch*: And that both *Iſaiah* and the *Jews* meant his Generation, as he was the *Son of God*, is plain, becauſe as the *Meſſiah* was the *Son of Man*, they did know that he was to be the *Son of David*, ver. 42. of this Chapter, and *Mat.* xxii. 42. And thus *Euſebius* underſtands and applies this Text to his Generation, which *no Words* can expreſs.

Eccl. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 2. p. 5.

Again, *John* xii. 34. *We have heard out of our Law, that* Chriſt *abideth for* ever; alluding to *Pſal.* cx. 4. *Thou art a* Prieſt *for* ever *after the Order of* Melchiſedec; which, by the way, ſhews their Conſtruction of this Text; for it was objected by the *Jews* to our Saviour for ſaying, that the *Son of Man* muſt be lift up: Tho' you ſay, that tho' *Melchiſedec is ſaid to have neither Beginning of Days, nor End of Life, when he is repreſented as a Type of Chriſt's earlieſt Origin and lateſt Duration; yet this is certainly without the leaſt Pretence of a proper Eternity.* Surely this Text ſhews at leaſt his *Eternal* Duration, as the aforemention'd Text, *John* vii. 27. and *having no Beginning of Days*, ſhews his *Eternal Generation* and *Exiſtence*; and if having no *Beginning of Days* does not mean this, then having *no End of Life*, does not ſignify his *Everlaſting Duration*: And as by your Expreſſion, *Earlieſt Origin*, you mean that our Saviour had a *Beginning*; ſo that of his *lateſt Duration* ſeems to imply, that he is to have an *End*, tho' you dare not in Terms ſay ſo. But what could the Apoſtle mean by adding to that Text, *But made like to the* Son of God, ſave only that as the *Son of God* had neither *Beginning* nor *End*, which is properly being *Eternal*, ſo *Melchiſedec*, that he might be a Type of him, is repreſented as *one*, of whoſe *Deſcent* or *Pedigree*, which was his *Beginning*, and of whoſe *Death* or *End*, no Account was given in Scripture, or could be given.

P. 25.

Heb. vii. 3.

ἀγχυεαλόγητος.

It is no Objection to what I have ſaid upon this Head, That the *Jews* expected their *Meſſiah* ſhould eſtabliſh a Temporal Kingdom in this World: For the greater he was, the more capable he was of doing it; and they (who had at firſt been under a Theocracy, which, by *their deſiring a King*, they rejected, and which was the Foundation of their Sin in asking

one) hoped to be again reſtored to that happy State under the irreſiſtible Power of the *Word of God*, who was to *ſubdue all Nations under his Feet, and to have the Heathen for his Inheritance, and the utmoſt Parts of the Earth for his Poſſeſſion.* And even ſome Chriſtians, the *Millenarians*, by miſinterpreting ſome Texts of Scripture, expected our Saviour to reign with his Saints 1000 Years upon Earth; and the very Apoſtles themſelves, who had fully acknowledged his Divinity, had yet Thoughts and Hopes of an *Earthly Kingdom* even juſt before his *Aſcenſion. Wilt thou at this Time reſtore again the Kingdom to Iſrael?* Pſal. xlvii. 3. ——ii. 8. Acts i. 6.

Fourthly, The Scriptures of the New Teſtament expreſsly declare our Saviour to be *God* in the *higheſt* Senſe.

The Texts which I have already cited in this Letter do abundantly ſhew this Truth; and this is ſo large a Field, that I will not pretend to mention them all; but ſome I will add, to aſſert and make good my Propoſition.

Mat. i. 23. An Angel from Heaven tells *Joſeph*, 'that his 'Name ſhall be called *Immanuel*, which being interpreted, is 'God with us, as had been foretold by *Iſaiah*, Chap. vii. 14.

Luke ii. 11, *&c.* 'A Multitude of Angels declare him to the 'Shepherds to be *Chriſt the Lord.*

Twice was this confirm'd by a Voice from God himſelf, that '*This is my beloved Son*, Matt. iii. 16, 17. and Ch. xvii. 5. in which laſt there is added a Command to the Three Apoſtles, *Hear ye him.*

Let us therefore hear what he ſays of himſelf, for they are the Words of no leſs than Almighty God, and what thoſe Apoſtles inſtructed from Heaven and taught of God, do ſay of him. Deut. xviii. 18, 19. John xii. 49, 50.

John iv. 26. He tells the Woman of *Samaria*, that *he is the* Meſſiah.

John ix. 35. And to the blind Man, that he is the *Son of God.*

John viii. 12. And to the *Jews*, that he is the *Light of the World*, as is ſaid of God, 1 *John* i. 5.

John vi. 38. That he *came down* from *Heaven.*

John vi. 33. That he *giveth Life to the World.*

John xvi. 28. That he *came forth from the Father*, &c.

And how the Diſciples underſtood this, is plain by their Anſwer, *viz.*

John xvi. 29. Lo now thou ſpeakeſt plainly, now we are ſure *that thou knoweſt all things*: *And*

John xvi. 30. *We believe that thou cameſt forth from God.*

I have already mention'd his Aſſertions of his *own Divinity* before the High Prieſt in ſuch Terms, as would be *Blaſphemy* to any but the *Great God.* And

John xvi. 24. *If ye believe not that I am, ye ſhall die in your Sins.*

John viii. 28. *When you have lift up the* Son *of* Man, *ye ſhall know that* I am.

——58. (In expreſs aſſertory Terms) *Before Abraham* was, *I am.*

This is the peculiar Name by which God declar'd himſelf to *Moſes*, *Exod.* iii. 14. and is repeated by God, *Deut.* xxxii. 39. And theſe Expreſſions of our Saviour are the very ſame that Almighty God uſes, *Iſa.* xliii. 10. that *ye may know and believe me, and underſtand that I am: Before me there was no God form'd, neither ſhall there be after me.*

Τὸ ὑψοῦν τὸν νοῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπάρατε. Lift up our Soul, raiſe our Expectations that thou art really the Meſſiah we look for.

John x. 24. When the *Jews* complaining, ſaid, *How long doeſt thou make us to doubt*, (or, as in the Margin of our Bibles, *hold us in Suſpence ?*) if *Thou be Chriſt, tell us* plainly ; and he does, v. 30. I *and my Father are one*, ἕν; not one *Perſon*, but one in *Eſſence* And ſo the *Jews* underſtood him ; imputing therefore to him *Blaſphemy*, and *taking up Stones to ſtone him for it.*

Nevertheleſs I may, perhaps, be told Two Things, That this is interpreted *One* in *Power* ; and that when the *Jews* underſtood by it, *v.* 33. that he made himſelf *God* ; our *Saviour*, v. 34. *&c.* makes, as it were, an Excuſe for that Expreſſion, ſaying, *Is it not written, I have ſaid ye are* Gods, *&c.*

Now, if it be to be underſtood *One* in *Power*, (tho' the *Jews* took it otherwiſe,) it will neceſſarily follow, that he is *One* in *Eſſence* too. For what are the Works. which are there mention'd, and which he did in his *Father*'s Name, and which teſtify'd of him, *v.* 25 ? no leſs than *v.* 28. *I give unto them Eternal Life* ; which ſurely *God* only can do ; for though our *Saviour* is appointed to judge the World. yet, as a *Judge*, he can't be ſaid to *give : Eternal Life is the Gift of* God, *Rom.* vi. 23.

Beſides, if he be *One* in *Power*, he muſt be *Omnipotent*, which of all the divine eſſential Attributes, does *moſt* denote *God* ; and there can't be Two *Omnipotents* diſtinct in Effence, any more than Two *Gods*.

And as to the Excuſe, it may be ſaid to be an Anſwer *ad hominem*, with a juſt Reproof of them ; but he did not reſt there, and leave them to think he meant no more, for *v.* 37, 38. he adds, *If I do not the Works of my* Father, *believe me not* ; *but if I do, tho' ye believe not* me, *believe the* Works, *that ye may know and believe that the* Father *is in* me, *and* I *in* Him : And that the *Jews* did certainly then underſtand that he made himſelf *God*, the following Verſe ſhews, *for they again ſought to take him*, as at the firſt they attempted, *to ſtone him.*

And *c.* xxii. 45. *He that ſeeth* me, *ſeeth* him *that ſent me* ; and *c.* xiv. 7. *If ye had known* me *ye ſhould have known* my Father *alſo, and from henceforth ye have* known *and* ſeen *him* : And repeats it again to *Philip*, reproaching him or asking him to ſhew them the *Father*, ſaying, *Have I been ſo long with you, and yet haſt thou not known* me ? *He that hath ſeen* me *hath ſeen the* Father ; *and how ſayeſt thou then*, Shew us *the* Father ?

Surely

Surely therefore, I may ſay, as our Saviour concludes the Account he ſends of himſelf to *John Baptiſt*, Matt. xi. 6. *Bleſſed is he whoſoever ſhall not be offended in me*; for as the Apoſtle ſays, 2 Cor. iv. v. 3, 4. *If our Goſpel be hid, it is hid to* (or in, ἐν) *them that are loſt*; which Expreſſion, *in*, ſeems to intimate that it muſt be *wilful* Ignorance; ſo glorious (as he adds) is the Light of it.

I might add what he did in his *own Name*, as a further Evidence of his *Divinity*, viz.

Forgiving of Sins; *giving the Holy Ghoſt*; working ſuch *Miracles* as never were wrought before, *viz.* in his *own Name*, and giving to others Power to *do the like and greater* in *his Name*, *riſing* or *raiſing himſelf from the Dead*; *receiving divine Worſhip*, ſuch as is due *to God alone*: All which are aſſerted of and by him, as is evident by plain Texts of Scripture, which I do not quote, becauſe I believe they are known to you, and cannot be deny'd.

So that for the Divinity of our Saviour, we have had the Teſtimony of *God* the *Father*, *who will not give his Glory to another*, and is *the God of Truth*, *and cannot lie*; and of *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf, *the Son of God*, *a Teacher of Righteouſneſs*, who would not be even a *good Man*, if he taught a *falſe* and *blaſphemous* Doctrine. I ſhall now proceed to give you the Teſtimony of the *Holy Ghoſt*, the *Spirit of Truth*, by *viſible* Actions and by *ſpeaking* in the Apoſtles, who have left us this Doctrine upon Record in their Writings: And then I may conclude, as St. *John* ſays, 1 *John* v. 10. *He that believeth not God, hath made him* a Lyar, *becauſe he believeth not the Record that* God *gave of his Son.*

John i. 32, &c. *John Baptiſt ſaw the Spirit of God deſcending upon him like a* Dove, *and*, He, *who ſent him to baptize, ſaid, Upon whom thou ſhalt ſee the* Spirit *deſcending and remaining on him*, the ſame *is* he, *which baptizeth with the* Holy Ghoſt; *and he bare Record that* This *is the* Son *of* God.

And as *no Man can ſay that* Jeſus Chriſt *is the* Lord *but by the* Holy Ghoſt, and *that all the Apoſtles were filled with the* Holy Ghoſt, and had the Advantage of *attending* him from the *beginning* of his Miniſtry, and of being *Eye-Witneſſes* of his *Majeſty*, and to have *ſeen* and *heard* many things, which are not recorded in the Goſpels, and to have had the Scriptures *expounded* to them by *Chriſt* himſelf *after* his *Reſurrection*; and that it was *given to them to know the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven*; and that St. *Paul*, in Particular, was in a miraculous Manner taught by Chriſt from Heaven, *and was an Apoſtle not* of Men, *neither* by Man, *but by* Jeſus Chriſt, *and* God *the* Father. Surely the Teſtimony of ſuch Witneſſes is much more valuable than thoſe which you have produced; tho' you had never ſo faithfully and fairly repreſented what your Authors ſay. For thoſe are the Teſtimonies of the *Holy Ghoſt*, which

1 Cor. xii. 3. Acts ii. 4. Acts i. 21. 2 Pet. i. 16. John xx. 21. xxi. 25. Luk. xxiv. 27. Luk. iv. 10. Acts ix. — 1 Tim. i. 1. Gal. i. 1. 12.

ſpake in them; and *what they writ*, St. *John c.* xx. 31. ſays, was for *this Purpoſe, that ye may believe that* Jeſus *is* the Chriſt, *the* Son *of* God.

Col. i. 19. *It pleas'd the* Father *that in* him *ſhould* all Fulneſs *dwell* (or *all* Fulneſs *was pleas'd to dwell in* him) *even* all *the* Fulneſs *of the* Godhead, *Col.* ii. 9. as our Saviour had ſaid, *John* xiv. 10. *The* Father *that dwelleth in* me; not by a *Communication* of the *Holy Spirit*, as *God* may be ſaid to have dwelt in the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, and indeed in every *good Man*, whoſe Bodies are the Temples of *God*; for *God gave not the Spirit by Meaſure to him*; nor much leſs in *Clouds* and *Ceremonies*, as the Glory of God between the *Cherubims*, term'd *Shechina*, the Habitation or Dwelling of God, but *eſſentially*. But having mention'd and ſaid ſomething of this Text before, when I conſider'd your Quotation of the 15th Verſe of this Chapter, this may ſuffice.

1 John iv. 15. 1 Cor. vi. 19. John iii. 34. Godw. Antiq. 68.

John i. 14. *We beheld the Glory, as of the* only-begotten *of the* Father: Which Phraſe is often repeated in Scripture, and muſt ſignify more than that *Chriſt* was, as truly *others* are the *Sons* of *God*, as being *created* by him; tho' you make *created* and *begotten* equivalent Expreſſions; and if they were, he could not be call'd, the *only*-begotten: Which Word *Only* ſufficiently diſtinguiſhes and denotes him emphatically *the Son*, as is ſaid by St. *Paul*, Heb. i. 2. God hath ſpoken to us, ἐν υἱῷ, *By the Son*; The *Son* by *eternal Generation*, and equal to the Father; as I have ſhewn already by the Scriptures, and by ſeveral Quotations out of the Authors you rely upon.

2 Pet. iii. 12. *Looking for the Coming of the Day of God.* That this was ſpoken of the Day of Judgment; and that the Day of Judgment is in Scripture calld *the Day of the Lord Jeſus*, is manifeſt both by the other Parts of this Chapter, and ſeveral other Places: And here St. *Peter* expreſsly ſtiles him *God*; and ſo does St. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. *God manifeſt in the Fleſh*; and *Tit.* ii. 10. *God our Saviour*; and v. 13. *the great God and our Saviour*: 1 John v. 10. *We know that the Son of* God *is come, and hath given us an Underſtanding, that we may know him that is true*; *and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt.* This (οὗτος, *this Perſon*) *is the true* God.

I have in a former Part of this Letter mention'd *Hebr.* i. 3. There is another Text, *Phil.* ii. 6. of the like Import; but more plain and expreſs, as I have before alſo obſerv'd: *Chriſt Jeſus, who being in the* Form *of God, thought it not* Robbery (*a taking to himſelf what did not belong to him, or* he had *no right to*) *to be* equal *with* God; *i. e.* God: Now being in the *Form of God* cannot as I ſaid before of the *Image* of his *Perſon*, be underſtood as if he were only a *Repreſentation* of God, and that he was not *really* and *truly* God, as is plain by the following Words; He took upon him the *Form* of a Servant, and *was made in the Likeneſs of Man, and being found in* Faſhion *as a Man.*——For

Μορφῇ.

Μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων.

it

it may as well be argued from theſe latter Words (as ſome Hereticks have deny'd his *Humanity*) that he was only in *Appearance*, and not *really* a *Man*, as that from the *Image* or *Form* of *God*, he was not *truly* God, and equal with God.

Rom. i. 20. St. *Paul* makes the Creation of the World to be a full Evidence and Proof of the *Eternal Power* and *Godhead*; and that the *World was made by the Son of God*, not *miniſterially*, but as *God*, I have before obſerv'd, and will be very plain by comparing together, 1 *Cor.* viii. 6. *Rom.* xi. 36. *Col.* i. 16. *John* i. 3.

And here I muſt take notice of your unfair Dealing, *p.* 6. where *Col.* ii. 9. is cited, *The Fulneſs of the Godhead*, you add, as if it were another Reading or Meaning of that Expreſſion (or *Divine Power*;) and you refer to this Text, *Rom.* i. 20. as if *this* juſtified you for ſo doing: Tho' in this Text the Word *Godhead* is us'd as well as *Power*; to which the Epithet *Eternal* is added, which you changed to *Divine*; as imagining, tho' in vain, that it would better ſuit your Purpoſe.

Rom ix. 5. *Whoſe are the Fathers, of whom concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all*, God *bleſſed for ever*. Amen. Thus it is render'd in our Bibles, and ſo by (i) *Novatian*, c. 13, & 30. but you tranſlate it (in your Letter to the Biſhop of *London*, p. 5.) *The God over all be bleſſed for ever. Amen.* But I ask, Why did you ſo render it; for neither the Context, nor the Apoſtle's Argument, nor the *Greek* (k) will warrant your ſo doing? For,

St. *Paul* in the 2d and 3d Verſes having expreſs'd his great Concern, even to a Degree *of wiſhing himſelf accurſed or ſeparated from Chriſt, for his Brethren, his Kinſmen, according to the Fleſh, leſt*, as he ſays, *c.* iv. 14. *thro' their Infidelity the Promiſe to Abraham ſhould be made of none Effect*: He proceeds in a very rhetorical *Climax* to ſet forth the great Privileges and Advantages they had, as ſo many Arguments to them above others, to embrace the Faith of Chriſt; ſaying, 'Who *are Iſ-*
'*raelites, to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the Glory*, and
'the *Covenant*, and the *giving of the Law*, and the *Service* (or
'true Worſhip, λατρεία) *of God*, and *the Promiſes*; *whoſe are*
'*the Fathers*, and *of whom, as concerning the Fleſh, Chriſt came*,
'*who is over all, God bleſſed for ever*: That is, tho' it was great Honour to them, that he deriv'd his human Nature from them; for he took on him the *Seed of Abraham*; yet as the Completion and Perfection of their Happineſs and Dignity, He was *over all*, and no leſs than *God bleſſed for ever*. And this was the *ſtrongeſt*

(i) Quorum Patres & ex quibus Chriſtus ſecundum carnem, qui eſt ſuper omnia, Deus benedictus in ſæcula.

(k) Τῶν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.

and a neceſſary Argument to induce them to a Belief in him, becauſe they expected their *Meſſiah* ſhould be ſomething more *than of the Stock of Abraham*, or *of the Lineage of David*. And had the Apoſtle ſtopp'd at, *of whom concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came*, the Argument had been no better than *Abimelech*'s to perſuade the Men of *Sichem to make him King*; *I am your Bone, and your Fleſh*. But *when Chriſt came* (as they ſaid *John* vii. 27.) *no Man knoweth whence he is*; and therefore the Apoſtle tells them, Tho' *according to the Fleſh he came of your Fleſh*, and *is Man*, yet he is alſo *truly Eternal God*; for without this Character of him, which they expected their *Meſſiah* to have, they might have been apt to have ſaid, as they did before they crucify'd him, Is not *this the Carpenter's Son?* And then the Concluſion would have been, as our *Saviour* ſaid, that *the Prophet would not have been without Honour, but among his own Kin, and in his own Houſe*.

Judg. ix. 2.

Mark vi. 45.

This I take to be the plain and natural Conſtruction of the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe; but you to force your Interpretation, firſt tranſpoſe the Words, and then conſtrue them ſo, as good Grammar will not bear; ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας; this, in the Letter and Order of the Words is, *being* over all *God bleſſed for ever: Being* muſt neceſſarily refer to, and agree with what went before; *viz. Chriſt*; and ſo *Tertullian* applies it; and therefore you leave out ὁ ὢν Being, and ſuppoſe ἐστὶ to be underſtood.

Contra prax. c. 13.

To ſum up this Matter; 'tis very obſervable, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of our *Saviour* in the *ſame Terms*, as the *Jews* uſe when they name *God*; for they generally add *Bleſſed for ever*, and *the Bleſſed* (alone, without the Addition of God) denotes *Almighty God*: as is evident by *Mark*. xiv. 61.

Dr. Hamm. Comment. 175.

1 John 15. *God is Light*; and this is ſaid alſo of *Chriſt*, John i. 9. by the ſame Apoſtle; and our Saviour ſays it of himſelf, *John* viii. 12. *I am the Light of the World.*

1 Tim. vi. 15. *God* is ſtil'd *King of Kings*, and ſo is *Chriſt*, Rev. xvii. 14. & xix. 20.

Acts xx. 28. Take heed to *feed the Church of* God, *which he hath purchas'd with his own Blood.*

Hebr. xiii. 8. Jeſus Chriſt the *ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever*; which ſurely denotes his Eternity; for this is equivalent to what is ſaid *Rev.* i. 4. of the great God, *which is*, and *which was*, and *which is to come.*

But Mr. *Seaton* having cited many Places of Scripture, in which the Things ſpoken of God, and which cannot be applied but to the mighty *God*, are alſo predicated in the higheſt Senſe of our *Saviour*; I ſhall ſay no more upon this Head, but only that our *Saviour* muſt therefore be *God*, or elſe we muſt charge even the Scriptures with Blaſphemy.

I preſume you will not deny, and therefore I need not quote Texts, that *Faith* in our *Lord Jeſus* is made neceſſary to the Remiſ-

Remiſſion of Sins, and eternal Salvation; that *all the* Miracles which were wrought by the Apoſtles, even the giving the Holy Ghoſt, were effected thro' *Faith* in *his* Name; and well therefore might he require, *John* xiv 1. *Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me.* For ſurely theſe are ſuch Inſtances of his *Godhead*, that without it no Creature could require, nor any Creature pay them to another.

To *Faith* in him I muſt add *Adoration* and *Worſhip*, which Men and Angels too are commanded to pay him.

It cannot be deny'd, but that *Prayers* directed *immediately* and *ultimately* to *him* are Acts of *Divine Worſhip*: St. *Stephen* did ſo, *Lord Jeſus receive my Spirit:* And the Apoſtles not only *pray'd* to him, but did it in the Form of *Bleſſing in his Name*, which in *all* Nations, in *all* Times has been done only in the Name of ſuch as they eſteem'd *Gods*: And 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. *The Holy Ghoſt* alſo is added (which is the Form now us'd in our *Liturgy*) and with great Reaſon; for our Saviour has commanded them *to baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt:* And this he requires them to teach all Nations. And in St. *Mark c.* xvi. 16. there is added to this Command, *He that believeth, and is baptiz'd, ſhall be ſaved; but he that believeth not ſhall be damned:* And Verſe 20. they went forth and preach'd, *The Lord confirming the Word* (this Doctrine) *with Signs* or *Miracles.* Surely this is a full Evidence that *all Three* Perſons are *God*; and therefore St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* i. *v.* 14, 15. thanks *God* that he baptiz'd *none*——— leſt any ſhould ſay, that he *baptiz'd in his own Name*: For *Baptiſm* is a *Dedication* of us to *God.* But if this may, nay muſt, be done to *Chriſt* and to the *Holy Ghoſt*, and yet the *One* be but a *Creature*, and the *Other* the *Creature* of *that Creature*, I know not how you will excuſe your ſelf from the *Popiſh* Superſtition of addreſſing themſelves to *Saints* and *Angels*, and imploring of them their Protection: Or even from *Pagan Idolatry*; for they had their tutelar Deities, which they did not eſteem their *Supreme God*: For let the Nature and Dignity of our *Saviour* be never ſo great and highly exalted, if he be leſs than *God*, we muſt ſay as the Angel did to St. *John*, Rev. xxii. 9. *See thou do it not, for I am thy Fellow-Servant——worſhip God*; for God himſelf has ſaid, *He will not give his Glory to another.*

Acts vii. 59.

Matthew xxviii. 19.

I know not how you will avoid this Difficulty, but by adviſing your Proſelytes not to baptize their Children, till the Time comes (which in your Poſtſcript to the Biſhop of *London*, you ſay you hope for) that there ſhall be a Reformation of our Doxology, for then the Form of Baptiſm may be alter'd too; but in the mean time to the *Arian* you add the *Anabaptiſt*; and yet I believe moſt of *them* are ſo good Chriſtians, as not to receive *you* into their Communion.

I muſt not omit, 1 *John* v. 7. *There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe Three are One.* I know you have a very ſhort Anſwer to this Text, that it was inſerted by ſuch as you now call *Athanaſians.* But this is a Point I ſhall leave to be argued by Learned Men: 'Tis enough for me that I find this Text in my Bible; and that it was in the Epiſtle before the Time of *Arius*; for St. *Cyprian* (who liv'd about the Middle of the Third Century) in Syllables quotes it; and therefore 'tis incumbent on the *Arians* to prove it was inſerted; and it requires very plain and expreſs Proofs to deprive us of ſo long a Poſſeſſion.

But it is aſtoniſhing, that you ſhould, *p.* 29. with ſo great Confidence peremptorily aſſert, that '*no one Perſon excepted* '*againſt the Word* Created *till* Athanaſius; *nor any one aſſerted,* '*that the Son was* uncreated *till he did it*:' For your own Quotations convict you, at leaſt the Authors you have directed me to, have furniſh'd me with many Inſtances that confute you; And have you never ſeen Biſhop *Bull*'s incomparable Book? Do you not know that your Learned Friend Dr. *Clark* rejects the Teſtimony of the Fathers? And does not Dr. *Waterland*, in his admirable Tract. give the Reaſon for it, *viz.* "*Becauſe he knows* "*they are againſt him?*

'Tis no leſs aſtoniſhing that you ſhould venture to aſſert, that
P. 37. '*for the Coeternity* of this *Spirit*, or even his equal Antiquity '*with the Son*, there is *not One proper* and *direct Teſtimony, Sa-*'*cred or Primitive, that you know of, now extant in the Records of* '*the Chriſtian Church; till long after the Council of* Nice, *in the* '*latter Days of* Athanaſius *himſelf.*' Experience has too much confirm'd the malicious Man's Rule, *fortiter calumniare, aliquid hærebit:* And there can be no Reaſon for ſuch bold poſitive Aſſertions, but only the Hope that ſome unwary Men may be thereby induced to think there may be ſome little Truth in them: For Men may be deceiv'd in ſuch Opinions, tho' no Arguments can be found ſufficient to convince them.

For my Part, I think the Texts and Teſtimonies, which you have cited to prove the Holy Ghoſt, *created, made and not eternal*, (if the firſt were *juſtly* and *truly* interpreted, and the latter *fairly* repreſented) would be ſufficient to confute you. But I ſhall ſhew,

Firſt, That you have miſerably mangled and miſrepreſented theſe Quotations; as you have done the Authorities relating to the *Son*: And that theſe very Authors, whom you have taught me to conſult, do, in other places, in moſt expreſs Words aſſert the *Divinity of the Holy Ghoſt*, as fully as we profeſs to believe it:

And then prove the ſame by plain Texts of Scripture.

Firſt,

First, You cite *Tertullian adverſus, Prax.* for ſaying, ‘ *I ſuppoſe* P. 85.
‘ *the Spirit is deriv'd from no other Original than from the Father*
‘ *by the Son*: *Tertullian*'s Words are, *Quia Spiritum non aliunde puto quàm à Patre per Filium.*

Origin might have been omitted in your Tranſlation, but that you thought it would ſeem to your Reader to imply a *Creation.*

The moſt that can fairly be inferr'd from this Paſſage, is, that in *Tertullian*'s Opinion the *Proceſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt* was from the *Father* by (διὰ) not *and* (καὶ) the Son, as the Doctrine of the *Greek* Church is, and has formerly been the Subject of a great Diſpute: But nevertheleſs, that this was not *Tertullian*'s Opinion, will appear by what follows, *p.* 877. *Tertius eſt Spiritus à Deo & Filio*: The Third is the *Spirit from God* (the Father) *and the Son.*

But to your Quotation, I further ſay:

Tertullian was anſwering an Objection, that Three Perſons in Adv. Prax.
the Godhead deſtroy'd the Monarchy of the Deity: ‘ *No*, ſays p. 845.
‘ *Tertullian*, (q) *for the Monarchy is to be underſtood to be then*
‘ *ſubverted, when another* Dominion *of its* own *Condition and*
‘ proper *State, and therefore emulous, is ſuperinduced*——
‘ *when another God is brought in, or there are* many *Gods*——
‘ *But I, who deduce the* Son, non aliundè, *from no other* than
‘ the *Subſtance* of the *Father*, how can *I* be ſaid to *deſtroy* the
‘ *Monarchy?* And ſo it muſt be ſaid in the *Third Degree*, be-
‘ cauſe I think the *Holy Spirit* is *non aliundè*, from no other than
‘ *from* the Father *by* the Son; as he had ſaid a little before,
‘ (r) How can God ſeem to ſuffer any *Diviſion* or *Diſperſion* in
‘ the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*, who hold the *Second* and *Third* Rank
‘ Partakers (Conſorts) of the *Subſtance* of the *Father*; as he had ſaid, *p.* 844 (againſt thoſe who believ'd *God* to be *One*, no otherwiſe than as if the ſame *Hypoſtaſis* or *Perſon* were *Father*, and *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*) (ſ) ‘ as it *One* might not be *All* in this
‘ Way

(q) Everſio monarchiæ illa eſt tibi intelligenda cùm alia Dominatio ſuæ conditionis & proprii ſtatus & per hoc æmula ſuperinduciter; cùm alius Deus infertur adverſus Creatorem, tunc malè cùm plures ſecundum Valentinos & Prodicos—— Cæterùm qui Filium non aliundé deduco ſed de ſubſtantiâ Patris———Quomodo Poſſum de fide deſtruere monarchiam——Hoc mihi & in Tertium gradum dictum ſit, quia Spiritum non aliundè puto quàm à Patre per Filium.

(r) Quale eſt ut Deus diviſionem & diſperſionem pati videatur in Filio & in Spiritu Sancto ſecundum & tertium fortitis locum tam conſortibus ſubſtantiæ Patris.

(ſ) Dum unicum Deum non aliàs putat credendum quàm ſi ipſum eundemq; & Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum dicar,

'Way alſo, ſo long as *All* are of *One*, *viz.* by the *Unity* of
'*Subſtance*. And the Divine Oeconomy diſpoſes this *Unity* in-
'to *Trinity*, *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*; *Three*, not in (*ſtatu*)
'*Condition*, but *Degree* (or *Order*;) not in *Subſtance*, but in
'*Form*, &c. Which, *p.* 853. he repeats, ſpeaking of the *Fa-
ther* and the *Son*, '(r) not *Two Gods*, but as *Father* and *Son*
'*Two*; not by any *Separation* of Subſtance, but by *Diſpoſition*;
'for we aſſert the *Son* to be *undivided* and *inſeparate* from the
'*Father*. And *p.* 847. (v) We ſay the *Son* proceeds by *Prola-
'tion* from the *Father*, but is not *ſeparated* from him. The *Fa-
'ther*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt* are *inſeparate* from each other.
'And *p.* 849. *Ubique teneo* unam *ſubſtantiam in tribus coharenti-
'bus.*

P. 36. Your Quotation out of *Origen*'s Comment on St. *John*, p. 56. is moſt ſtrangely repreſented; for upon the Text in St. *John*, that *all things were made by the* Word, he ſtates *Three* Opinions; not that any of them were given as *his own*, but as in the Perſon of *others*; and the Concluſion, which may ſeem to be his Opinion, you have perverted by your Tranſlation.

The firſt of theſe Opinions is, that 'whoever *ſays that the*
'Holy Spirit *is a Being* made, *and allows this Text in St.* John,
'*muſt of Neceſſity allow*, *that he was* made *by the* Word, and
'by Conſequence (here you make a *N. B.*) *the* Word *was*
'*more ancient than* He.

Now all this is certainly true, if the *Holy Spirit* be a Being *made*; but this wants to be prov'd, nor is it *Origen*'s Aſſertion; and the Conſequence, that, in that Caſe, the Word is *more* ancient than *He*, is alſo certain and obvious without your *N. B.* Which ſhews indeed your own Opinion, but not *Origen*'s, tho' perhaps you inſerted it to induce the Reader to think ſo.

The Second Opinion is, 'That *whoever will not admit the* Ho-
'ly Spirit *to be* made *by* Chriſt, *muſt by Conſequence ſay that he*
'*is* Unbegotten, *if he judges what is ſaid in* (*not* the, *as you*
'*render it generally*, *but*) this *Goſpel*, (viz. *this Text in St.* John)
'*to be true.*

---

cat; quaſi non ſic quoq; unus ſit omnia, dum ex uno omnia per ſubſtantiæ ſc. Unitatem; & nihilominus cuſtodiatur οἰκονομίας ſacramentum quæ unitatem in Trinitatem diſponit, tres dirigens Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum, tres autem non ſtatu ſed gradu, nec ſubſtantiâ ſed formâ, &c.

(r) Dii non duo, ſed quà Pater & Filius duo, non ex ſeparatione ſubſtantiæ ſed ex diſpoſitione, inviduum & inſeperatum Filium â Patre pronunciamus.

(v) Prolatum dicimus Filium à Patre, ſed non ſeparatum, inſeperatos ab alterutro Patrem, Filium & Spiritum Sanctum Teſtor.

Here

Here you ſtop, as it were, to give us our Choice of theſe Two Opinions; knowing, that tho' we do aſſert that the *Holy Spirit* is a *neceſſary Efflux* of the *Deity*, as *proceeding* from the *Unbegotten Father*, (as we ſay the *Son* is alſo by being *begotten* of the *Father*) yet we do acknowledge that *Unbegotten* is ſaid particularly of the *Father*, and, in Conſequence of this our Doctrine, you imagine, that ſince we both ſhall diſallow this *ſecond* Opinion, (unleſs you will change the Term *Unbegotten* to *unmade*, as ἀγένητον alſo ſignifies) we muſt agree with you in this *firſt*.

But you have omitted the *Third* Opinion, which is of one who aſſerts, (p) '*That there is no proper, peculiar* Eſſence (ἰδίαν ' ὐσίαν) of the *Holy Spirit different* from the *Father* and the ' *Son*,

If by ἰδίαν ὐσίαν ſhould be meant *no diſtinct Perſonality*, we ſhall both agree in rejecting this Third Opinion, and ſo does *Origen* too. Pamph. Apol. p. 76.

But if ἰδίαν ὐσίαν be taken, as I have render'd it, (and it properly ſignifies) for *Subſtance* or *Eſſence*, then here the *Conſubſtantiality* of the *Holy Spirit* is aſſerted: Then the Text, *Matt.* xii. 32. is cited, that *Blaſphemy againſt the* Son *ſhall be forgiven, but againſt the* Holy Ghoſt, *ſhall not be forgiven*; as it is alſo cited in *Pamphilus*'s Apology, p. 674. with this Expreſſion of Admiration, (q) ' O, how *great* is the *Majeſty* of the *Holy Spirit!*

Then immediately after this Text in St. *Matthew*, follows the laſt Part of your Quotation, which for the ſtrange Tranſlation and perverting of it, I will ſet down in diſtinct Columns.

In your Tranſlation.	As in the GREEK.
We who are perſuaded, that the Father, Son, *and* Holy Ghoſt *are* Three Subſtances, *and*	(r) *We therefore who are perſuaded, that there are Three* Perſons *or* Subſiſtences, Father, Son,

(p) Ἔσαι ὅ τις καὶ τείτῳ φρενὶ τοὺ δύο —— δογματίζων μηδὲ ὐσίαν τινὰ ἰδίαν ὑφεσάναι τὸ ἁγίε πνεύματος ἑτέραν φρενὶ τ πατέρα καὶ τ ὑιὸν.

(q) Quis ergo non obſtupeſcat quanta Majeſtas ſit Spiritûs Sancti.

(r) Ἡμεῖς μὲντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν τ πατέρα τ ὑιὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἀγένητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τῶ παλαιὸς εἶναι πιςεύοντες ὡς ἀσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς ἡγοίμεθα τὸ πάντων διὰ τ λόγε ἡνωμένων, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι πιςώτερον καὶ τάξει παντων ὑπὸ τῶ παλαιὸς διὰ χριςῶ γεγενημένων.

and do believe there is nothing unbegotten *but the* Father; *do admit this Notion as agreeable to Piety and Truth, that when all things are ſaid to be* made by the Word, *the* Holy Spirit *is the* moſt honourable, *and* Firſt *in Order of thoſe Beings which the Father made by Chriſt.*

Son, *and* Holy Ghoſt, *and do believe that there is nothing* unbegotten *but the* Father, *or that is* different from *the* Father; *do admit as pious and true,* (*all Things being made by the* Word) *that the Holy Ghoſt is more* honourable *than all Things, and in* Order *or* Station, *than all Things made by the Father by* Chriſt.

Beſides other Faults in your Tranſlation, I muſt take notice that you turn πμιώτερον into a Superlative, *moſt* honourable, in ſpight of your Grammar, and inſert *Firſt* in ſpight of your Author, in which it is not.

The Import of this Paſſage ſeems to be this: That there are *Three diſtinct Perſons* or *Subſiſtences*, (not *Subſtances*) viz. *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*; and tho' it be true, that there is nothing *unbegotten* but the *Father*, and that all Things were made by *him*; yet 'tis true too, that the *Holy Ghoſt*, who is One of thoſe Three Perſons, is *more honourable* than all Made or Created Beings, and is in *Rank* and *Station above*, or *more honourable* than all Things made *by* the *Father*, *by or through Chriſt.*

But whatever Doubt there may be of *Origen*'s Opinion or Expreſſions in this Paſſage, the Account which *Pamphilus* gives of him is full and clear, and ſets forth *Origen*'s Sentiments of the Holy Spirit in Terms indiſputable.

Pamph. Apolog.

(i) P. 760. *Origen* ſays, 'He could not find one Word in the 'Scriptures, by which the Holy Ghoſt could be ſaid to be a Creature: and yet, of all the Fathers, none were better, ſcarce ſo well, vers'd in the Scriptures as *Origen.*

(k) P. 764. he ſays, 'That *Baptiſm was not compleat, but by* 'the Authority of the Trinity, that is, by the Naming of the Fa-'ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and, particularly, that the Name of 'the Holy Ghoſt muſt be join'd with the Father and Son.

(i) Verumtamen uſq; ad præſens nullum ſermonem in Scripturis ſanctis invenire potuimus, per quem Spiritus Sanctus Creatura eſſe diceretur.

(k) Salutare baptiſmum non niſi excellentiſſimæ Trinitatis authoritate; *i. e.* Patris & Filij, & Spiritûs Sancti cognominatione compleatur, & innato Deo & unigenito ejus Filio, nomen quoq; Spiritus Sancti copuletur.

(l) P. 765.

(1) P. 765. He makes the *Omniſcience* of the *Holy Spirit* a Proof of his *Divinity*, ſaying, ' *That as the Father and the Son* ' *knows the Beginnings and Ends of all Things, ſo alſo does the Holy* ' *Spirit; which is impoſſible for a Creature to do.*

I have in a former Place taken notice of your Quotation, *p.* 35. of *Irenæus*, that the Text in *Geneſis*, *Let us make*, &c. was ſpoken to the *Holy Ghoſt*, as well as to the *Son*; and you have alſo cited him for applying the 8th of the *Proverbs* to the *Holy Spirit*; and then, notwithſtanding your Notion of the *Creation* of the *Holy Ghoſt* by the *Son*, if the *Son* was created the Beginning of his Ways, and the *Holy Ghoſt* was alſo created the Beginning of his Ways, then there are *Two* Beginnings.

And tho' I have alſo quoted *Athenagoras* before, I muſt once more mention what he ſays, *viz.* ' The *Holy Ghoſt* is the *Efflux* ' of God, flowing from and reflected back to him, as the Rays ' of the Sun. Who then would not wonder, that they ſhould ' be call'd *Atheiſts*, who acknowledge *God* the *Father*, *God* the ' *Son*, and the *Holy Ghoſt*, ſhewing both their *Power* in *Unity*, ' and *Diſtinction* in *Order*?

And now ſurely I may venture to contradict you, and ſay, that there are ſome proper and direct primitive Teſtimonies for the equal Antiquity of the *Holy Ghoſt* with the *Son*, nay, and for his *Coeternity*. For *Athenagoras* and *Irenæus* liv'd in the Second Century; *Tertullian*, *Origen* and *Pamphilus* in the Third, long before *Arius* broach'd his Hereſy, or *Athanaſius* had Occaſion to aſſert our *Faith* in Oppoſition to it; ſo that you muſt blot theſe out of your Catalogue, *p.* 29. of the Defenders of your Doctrine, and the reſt too, if your Quotations out of them be like theſe which I have examin'd; and I have a Right to conclude they are no better, till theſe are juſtify'd to be *true* and *fair*; which, I am confident, is impoſſible to be done.

I ſhall now mention ſome of the Sacred Teſtimonies, which the Scriptures afford us.

I have already taken notice of the *Form* of *Bleſſing* in the Name of the *Holy Ghoſt*, as well as of the *Father* and of the *Son*; and that we are in like Manner to be baptiz'd; and of the Inference *Origen* makes from the *Omniſcience* of the *Holy Spirit*. And St. *Paul* ſays, 1 *Cor.* c. ii. *v.* 10. ' *The* Spirit *ſearch-* ' *eth the deep Things of* God; and *v.* 11. ' *The Things of* God 'Ουδεις. ' *knoweth* no *Man, but the* Spirit *of* God.

So 1 *Cor.* xii. St. *Paul* reckons up the ſeveral Gifts of the *Holy Spirit*, in the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th Verſes; and in the 28th

---

(1) Sicut Pater novit initia omnium quæ ſunt & fines, ſic & Filius ſic & Spiritus Sanctus ſciat id; quod impoſſibile eſt omni Creaturæ cognoſcere.

ſic

he aſcribes them all to *God*; and as he ſays in the 4th Verſe, 'There *are Diverſities of Gifts, but* the ſame Spirit: So in the 4th and 5th Verſes he ſays, 'It *is the ſame* Lord, *the* ſame 'God *which worketh* all in all.

Rom. ix. 1. St. *Paul* calls the *Holy Ghoſt* to witneſs: This is, *ſwearing* by him, which is appealing to him as knowing our Hearts, which *God* only does. *I the Lord ſearch the Heart, I try the Reins*, Jer. xvii. 10. And 'tis an Act of *Adoration* due only to *Almighty God*; and therefore our Saviour forbids us to ſwear even by *Heaven*, tho' it be the *Throne* of God, *Matth.* v. 34.

Acts v. 3. St. *Peter* tells *Ananias*, *he had lied to the Holy Ghoſt*; and *v.* 4. he ſays that by ſo doing, he had *lied unto God.*

Acts xiii. 2. *The Holy Ghoſt ſaid, Separate* me *Barnabas* and *Paul*; and *v.* 4. they being ſent forth, preached, *v.* 5. the *Word of God.*

Theſe may be ſufficient to ſhew, that there are Sacred Teſtimonies alſo aſſerting the Godhead of the *Holy Ghoſt.*

P. 1. And therefore let me expoſtulate with you, Why you never make him the direct Object of any Doxology at all? For if he be *God*; if he beſtows upon us all other Gifts and Graces, by which we are enabled to do any Service to *God*, as is evident both by Sacred and Primitive Teſtimonies, all Acts of Adoration are due to him; and, *ad hominem*, I may ſay, you eſpecially ſhould not deny this to him; becauſe in the Doxologies, which you quote, you allow this *Act of Divine Worſhip* to be paid to *Chriſt*, tho' you make him but a *Creature*; which, if but a *Creature*, ought not to be paid to him.

There can be no doubt, but that the Doxologies in the Scripture may be piouſly us'd by any good Chriſtian; God forbid, that they ſhould be call'd *Arian*: But if they who deny the *Divinity* of the *Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*, uſe theſe Doxologies in Oppoſition to *the Divinity of Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, and as a Declaration of their Denial of it, then they are *Arians*, or ſomething (I know not what, for you call both *Arians* and *Athanaſians* Hereticks) which is *not Chriſtian*, by wreſting and abuſing thoſe Scriptures to a Purpoſe very different from the Doctrine therein expreſsly aſſerted and deliver'd to us. The Devil quoted to our Saviour the Scripture exactly in Syllables; but in the Application and Uſe he made of it, he was ſtill a *Devil*, a *Tempter*, and a *Liar*, as much as *from the Beginning.*

Letter to the Biſhop of London, p. 5.

Pſal. xci. 11.

Mat. iv. 6.

Luk. iv. 10.

Now whatever may be that *Sin* againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, which our Saviour ſays ſhall never be forgiven, ſurely, *denying* that *Holy Spirit*, reducing this *Third* Perſon in the *Bleſſed Trinity* to a *Creature*, and that of a *Creature*; and doing this *deſpight* to the *Spirit of Grace*, muſt *moſt* of all be a Sin againſt *Him*: And

Heb. x. 29.

tho' there be a Sin *unto Death*, for which St. *John* will not ſay that *we ſhall pray*, yet in Charity I will hope you are not ſo harden'd in it, but that you will find Place for Repentance, and a Way *to change your* Mind; and, in order to it, will ſeek it *earneſtly with Tears*; and therefore (tho' *you value not Anathema's*, p. 41.) accept of my Prayers, that *that Holy Ghoſt*, that *Paraclet*, that *Advocate*, who maketh *Interceſſion for* us, *with Groanings which cannot be utter'd*, may give you his *Grace* to ſee your Error, and to repair by a publick Recantation (as much as in you lies) that Scandal, which you have given to all true Chriſtians by ſo *unwarranted* and *Blaſphemous* a Doctrine.

1 John v. 16. Heb. xii. 17. Μετανόιας τόπον. Rom. viii. 26.

I ſhould now, according to your Method, ſum up the Evidence on both Sides; but when I conſider how *few* Texts of Scripture you have cited, and how ſtrangely you have *miſconſtrued* and *miſapply'd* them; and how you have *mangled* your Teſtimonies, by *leaving out* and *putting* in whatſoever ſuited your Purpoſe; I may very juſtly ſay, as you do, *p.* 37. *it is not neceſſary to divide them under Two Heads*; for you may be ſaid to have *made* Evidence, but to have *produced* none: So that if *renouncing your firſt Faith*, into which you were baptiz'd, be *a Falling away*, and *that be a Crucifying the Son of God afreſh*, I doubt we cannot ſay for the ſame Reaſon, for which our Saviour pray'd for them, who actually did crucify him, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*

Heb. i. 6. Luk. xxiii. 34.

On the other hand; if the *Texts* and *Prophecies* in the *Old Teſtament*, which teſtify of the *Meſſiah*, and what he was to be; and if the *Opinion* and *Expectation* of the *Jews* founded thereupon be of any Value:

Joh. v. 39.

If *Revelations from Heaven*, the *Voice* of *God* the *Father* bearing Witneſs of him, the *Holy Spirit* of *Truth*, the *Aſſertions* of our *Saviour himſelf*, and the *Writings* of the *inſpir'd Apoſtles*, and their *Succeſſors*, to the Time of *Arius*, are *ſufficient* Evidence of *Truth*:

If *Miracles*, ſuch as *no* Man *ever* did, wrought by *his own* Power, and in *his own Name*, raiſing *himſelf* from the *Dead*, *authoritatively* forgiving *Sins*, *giving* the *Holy Ghoſt* and *Eternal Life*, *receiving* and *requiring* from *all* Men *Adoration*, and *Worſhip*, and *Honour*, *no leſs* than what is paid to the *Father*, are as good Proofs of his *Divinity*, as they are of *Omnipotency*, which I take to be *ſynonimous*;

Then the *Author* and *Finiſher* of *our Faith*, the *Lord Jeſus*, is *eternally God*, the *God* of our *Salvation*; and we muſt *with joyful Lips praiſe him*, and ſay, *Before thou hadſt form'd the World, from Everlaſting to Everlaſting thou art God.*

Pſal. xc. 2.

And *no leſs* is the *Holy Spirit*; for which the Authorities and Proofs have been but ſo little beforemention'd, that I need not repeat them.

This

This is the *Faith* which has been *deliver'd to the Saints*; this has been *profeſs'd* and *taught* for 300 Years after *Chriſt*, (as the incomparable Biſhop *Bull* hath irrefragrably prov'd;) This is what hath been *confirmed* by their *Miracles*, and *ſeal'd* with their *Blood*; and alſo of their *Succeſſors*, in Oppoſition to *Arius* and his Diſciples, and in Spight of the *ſevereſt*, and indeed *more* barbarous Perſecution than ever was ſuffer'd under the moſt *cruel* and *inhuman Heathens*. This *Seed* of the *Church* has brought forth *Fruit* for theſe 1300 *Years* from that Time: In all which long Time, have there been no *learned*, no *pious*, *unbiaſs'd* Men in the *Chriſtian Church*, in no Part of the World, to reſcue our Holy Religion from the *Errors* which you now impute to it? Were they all, in all theſe Ages, *corrupt* and *become abominable?* Was there none that would do ſo *great good*; *no, not one?* This is a very *heavy* (think whether it be not alſo a very *arrogant*) Charge: Think whether againſt ſuch a *Cloud* of *Witneſſes*, a Man may not be ſuſpected to be *wiſe in his own Conceit*; eſpecially ſince one Apoſtle has told us, that *grievous Wolves will enter in*, not *ſparing the Flock*; (and ſuch ſurely the *Arians* have prov'd, and even more than at firſt the *Gnoſticks*:) And that Men ſhould ariſe, *ſpeaking perverſe Things, to draw away Diſciples after them*; ſuch as *ſilly Women*, or *Men weak in Faith*: And another Apoſtle has foretold, that there ſhall be *falſe Teachers, who ſhall privily* (I wiſh I had no Occaſion now to add *Openly*) *bring in damnable Hereſies*, (I am ſorry to reckon you among them, as I muſt by the Deſcription which the ſame Apoſtle gives of them, *viz.*) *even denying the Lord that bought them.*

Acts xx. v. 29, 30.

2 Tim. iii. 6.

Rom. xiv. 1.

2 Pet. ii. 1.

John xvi. 13. xiv. 26.

And unleſs that *Holy Ghoſt*, who was ſent from *Heaven* to *lead and guide* us *into all Truth*, and to *teach us all Things*, has taught you to deny himſelf; and that you can evidence your Doctrine, as the Apoſtles did that, which they *did*, and we *do* profeſs, by the miraculous Gifts of that *Holy Ghoſt*; you muſt excuſe *me*, and Mankind will excuſe *themſelves* from ſubmitting to your *Authority*, and *peremptory*, *ill-grounded* Aſſertions, in Contradiction of *thoſe Apoſtles* who, we both agree, did write as *they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt.*

Jer. xxxi. 34. Heb. viii. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 16. 2 Tim. iii. 15.

And tho' it be one great Bleſſing and Privilege of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, foretold by the *Prophet*, and repeated by St. *Paul*, that all ſhall *know the Lord*, *from the leaſt to the greateſt*; and the Scriptures were written for this Purpoſe, and *are profitable for Inſtruction*; and are *able to make us*, and even Children (for literally *Timothy*, to whom it is ſaid, had *known them from a Child*) *wiſe unto Salvation*; yet they muſt be forbid to all *Proteſtants*, as well as *Papiſts*, who are not ſo learned and cunning Interpreters of them as your ſelf and your Friends, leſt they ſhould be led by them into that *Faith* and *Worſhip* of their *Fathers*, *which you call Hereſy*. Biſhop *Kidder* mentions a *fabulous* Story among the *Jews*,

Acts xxiv. 20.

That

That when *Almighty God* dictated the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis* to *Moſes*, and came to the 26th Verſe, *Let Us make Man*; *Moſes* was *ſtartled*, and pray'd him to *alter* that Expreſſion, leſt it might be interpreted of a *Plurality* of *Gods*; but was anſwered, *Write* as *I command* you: So I fancy if you had been the *Amanuenſis* to the *Apoſtles*, you would have propos'd to them to alter thoſe *ſacred* and *inſpir'd* Writings, which ſo *expreſsly* aſſert the *Divinity* of the *Son* and *Holy Ghoſt*; and *they* would have anſwered you, as *God* did *Moſes*, or as St. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians* in the Caſe of the Lord's Supper, *What I deliver to you, I received of the Lord*; and as he tells the *Epheſians, I muſt not ſhun to declare unto you all the Counſel of God*; for there will ariſe Men *ſpeaking perverſe Things*, &c. and *other Foundation can no Man lay, than what is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt.*

1 Cor. xi. 23. Acts xx. v. 27. Ver. 30. 1 Cor. iii. 11.

To conclude: *Faith*, ſays the Apoſtle, *is the Evidence of Things not ſeen*, not to be judg'd by our *Senſe* or ſhallow *Reaſoning* grounded upon it: *Hardly do we gueſs aright at Things that are upon Earth, but the Things that are in Heaven, who hath ſearched out? For the more thou ſearcheſt, the more thou ſhalt marvel*, at the infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God in viſiting his Creatures, till we come *to ſee him as he is*, and to *know him even as we are known.*

Heb. xi. i. Wiſd. ix. 16. 2 Eldr. iv. 26. 1 John iii. 2.

I pray God to enlighten your Eyes, that you may know at leaſt *in this your Day the Things which belong to your Peace*: And God grant that we may meet in Communion with the Church of God here, and with the Saints hereafter: That beginning our Praiſes upon Earth, we may be admitted to join with the heavenly *Choir* in *eternal Alleluiahs*, to the Glory of *God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt, One God, Bleſſed for ever.* This is the ſureſt Mark, I can give you, of Friendſhip: And that

1 Cor. xiii. 12. Luke xix. 42. Eph. i. 18.

I am,

Your Humble Servant,

Burley,
Sept. 23. 1719.

NOTTINGHAM.

POSTSCRIPT.

THERE are ſome Things in your Letter *relating* to this Controverſy, but not *properly* the *Subject* of it, which I have not taken notice of in the foregoing Letter, though they ſeem more particularly addreſs'd to me than all the reſt; and therefore I will now tell you what you may expect from me concerning them.

P. 38. You wiſh that I may be a happy Means of bringing all the Parts of our '*old genuine* Chriſtianity to ſuch a *fair*, *open* and '*impartial* Examination, as you have propos'd.

If you mean, as you ought, that *Method*, which in *all* Ages has been the Practice of the *Church* in determining *Controverſies*, I heartily concur with you; and we have in our happy *Conſtitution* that Method *eſtabliſh'd* by *Law*: The *Convocation* is a Part of the *Parliament*; and as of Right it muſt be ſummon'd with the *Parliament*; ſo that *Summons* will be rendred *inſignificant* and *nugatory*, if they are not permitted to *ſit* and *act* in *taking Care of that Flock of Chriſt*, of *which the Holy Ghoſt has made them Overſeers*, and which the *Laws* of the *Land* have committed to them; eſpecially at a Time when the *Doctrines* of our moſt holy *Faith*, and the *Apoſtolical Inſtitution* of the *Government* of our *Church*, are ſo virulently attack'd, and in ſo open and inſolent a Manner.

It was the Advice of *Mecænas* to *Auguſtus*, never to ſuffer any Innovation in Religion; becauſe the Peace of the State depended upon it: That Prince had Peace in all the World; but what *Diſturbances*, what *Miſeries*, *Innovations* in *Religion* have caus'd in *this* Nation, the Hiſtory of the *laſt* Age informs us ſufficiently; and how *fatal* the *Feuds* and *Animoſities*, occaſion'd by the *Pretenders* to Religion, in this may be, *no* Man can *foretel*, *every* good Man *fears*.

Now whatever ill Uſe has been made of the Text for ſuffering the *Tares*, *which* were *ſown by the Enemy*, *to grow up with the Wheat*; yet ſurely we are not to lay our ſelves to ſleep *on purpoſe* to *give* the Enemy an *Opportunity* to ſow them. The *Jews* reckon

reckon they are forbid even by the Law of *Moſes* to revile the *Gods* of other Nations, which were *no Gods:* But that the *Son of God*, whom we, and all *Chriſtendom*, adore as the *God of our Salvation*, ſhould be *revil'd*, *trampled upon*, and *put* to *open Shame* by *thoſe* of our *own Nation*, in Contempt of the *Laws* of the *Land* as well as of *God*, *uncontroul'd*, without any *Animadverſion*, without giving the proper Champions of our *Faith* an Opportunity to *refute* and *reclaim* them from their *Errors*, is ſo unaccountable a Proceeding both in *Prudence* and *Religion*, that I will hope a ſpeedy Remedy will be apply'd to it; and that *thoſe*, who are in *Authority*, will free themſelves not only from the *Suſpicion*, but from the *real Guilt* too of being *Partakers* of *other Men's Sins*; for, *qui non prohibet, cùm poteſt, jubet:* And therefore that they will adviſe his Majeſty to give the *Fathers* and *Paſtors* of *our Church* Leave to ſpeak for themſelves, and indeed for the *King*: For *Defender of the Faith* is not an *empty* Title. The *Defence* of the *Church* of *England*, and the *holy Religion* profeſs'd in it, is the *Foundation* of the *Revolution*, and of *His Majeſty's Succeſſion* to the *Throne*. And, after all our Experiments, this Church will be found to be, as was ſaid of the Sanctuary, *The Excellency of our Strength*, and indeed of all the *Proteſtants* in *Europe*; who, as much as they want our *Support*, will have little Reaſon to think we ſhall be much concern'd for *them*, with *whom*, in ſome Points we differ, if we ſhew but little Zeal for our *common Chriſtianity*, in which we *agree*. Ezekiel xxiv. 21.

By what I have now ſaid, in the foregoing Letter, you may eaſily conclude, what my Opinion will be of your Demand of an open *Toleration:* If the *Lord Jeſus* be a *Creature*, and you worſhip him, 'tis *Idolatry:* If he be *God*, and you deny him, 'tis *Blaſphemy*. And what Puniſhment *Almighty God* ordain'd for *both* theſe *Sorts* of *Offenders* you know. What Texts have you to quote for an Exemption from *thoſe* Penalties; or, at leaſt, *ſuch* as the *Laws* of the *Land* inflict? What can we ſay in Conſcience for an *Indulgence*, and thereby, in ſome Meaſure, *eſtabliſhing* theſe *Iniquities* by a *Law?* When the *Jews* aſſaulted the Chriſtians, and were beaten * even before the Judgment-Seat, 'twas no ſmall Reproach to *Gallio*, that he *cared for none of thoſe Things*. Shall the States of the Realm out-do that *ſtupid Governor*, and even *countenance*, nay *authorize* Aſſaults upon the *Lord Jeſus* himſelf? Thus we ſhould expoſe our ſelves to that ſevere Rebuke, *Theſe are the Wounds, which I receiv'd in the Houſe of my Friends*. Zech. xiii. 6.

* *i. e. By the* Greeks. Acts xviii. 17.

Bnt if this were not the Caſe, with what Face can *Arians* ask ſuch Favour from any who have ever read the Hiſtory of their *Barbarities?* I might ſay, They have taught us a *Leſſon againſt themſelves*; but I am far from inferring from thence a *Retaliation*; but ſurely 'tis a *prudent*, and, in this looſe Age, a *neceſſary* Caution, not to admit ſuch *Enemies*

within our *Walls*, nor make it poſſible for them ever to be in a Condition to practiſe the like again.

As for that wonderful Book, as you call it, *p.* 40. '*The* '*Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, by which you would have the *Doctrine*, '*Diſcipline*, *Government*, *Worſhip* and *Canons* of the *Church* a-'mended; or rather that it might be admitted entirely as an '*Original Rule* and *Standard* in theſe Matters: I am not learned enough to argue from Authorities that This is not *genuine*; but I have ſome Things againſt the Uſe *You* have made of it, and which you deſire *others* and the *whole Church of God* to do too.

P. 40, 41. You your ſelf ſay, *p.* 41. That you believe it to be *genuine*, and *for the main* uncorrupt. I cannot well reconcile theſe Two: For if there be any *known* Corruptions in it, then it is not *genuine* and *Authentick*; or at leaſt it muſt be purg'd of thoſe *Corruptions*, before it can be of *any Authority*: And how ſhall we diſtinguiſh them? I know you have a ſhort Rule for it, *viz.* Whatever does not *ſuit* with your *Opinion* is *corrupt*; and by the ſame Reaſon, whatever does not ſuit with your *Adverſaries Opinion*, muſt be judg'd by *them* to be *corrupt*: And at this Rate the *whole* muſt be laid aſide; and indeed it is very fit it ſhould be ſo.

For how can *This* be a *Rule* and *Standard*, which muſt it ſelf be *try'd* by ſome *other Rule*, before it can in Reaſon be admitted to be ſo? And if *in the Scriptures the* Whole *Counſel of God hath been made known to us*; if, as in the 6th Article of our Church, *they contain* All *Things neceſſary to Salvation*, or as St. *Paul* ſays, *are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation*, What need have we to ſeek for another Rule? Or to *heap* to our ſelves Teachers, having itching Ears? For 'tis, as St. *Paul* tells us, an *Evidence*, that we will *not* endure *ſound Doctrine*.

Acts xx. 27.

2 Tim. iii. 15.

2 Tim. iv. 3.

But I will ſuppoſe your Quotations out of this Book, (for I have not compar'd them) are, not like your *other* Quotations, but, in *all* Reſpects, *right* and *fair*: Then if *theſe* are *inconſiſtent* with the *avow'd* Writings of the *Apoſtles*, as *moſt certainly* they are; Which of the *Two* ſhall a Man, that is to form his *Faith*, be guided by? Thoſe Writings which are acknowledg'd by *Both* to be *genuine*, and *written* by *Inſpiration*; or *thoſe*, which are *controverted?* The Choice is *Eaſy*; and beſides the *genuine* Scriptures being *firſt written*, St. *Paul* ſays, tho' an Angel *from Heaven ſhould preach any other Goſpel than that which we have preach'd unto you, Let him be accurſed.*

Gal. i. 8.

But ſuppoſe you could anſwer *every* Objection to *this wonderful* Book, (which I am confident you *cannot* as a Scholar; and I am ſure you cannot *reconcile* or *maintain* the Contradictions in it to the *true* Scriptures) I pray you to conſider the *Conſequence* of it, and the Miſchief you do to *Religion* by the Attempt of it; for the *genuine Scriptures* and *this* Book cannot *both* be *true*; but if *both* be *aſſerted* and *made out* to be of *equal* Authority, the Conſequence muſt be (and *wicked Men*, *Atheiſts* and

and *Deiſts* will not fail to infer it) that we muſt believe *neither*; for tho' *one* Part of a *Contradiction* muſt be *true*, yet a Witneſs, who affirms *both* Parts, is never *believ'd*, but is ſet *aſide* as a *falſe* one in *all* Courts of the World; becauſe *one* Part of what he ſays muſt be *falſe*; and there can be no Reaſon or Obligation *from him* to believe *one* Part of what he ſays more than the *other*: So that if the *Apoſtles* have really *writ* or *dictated* both the *ſacred Books* and the *Conſtitutions*, they muſt loſe all Credit of *Inſpir'd* Writers, and conſequently you have furniſh'd a ſufficient Argument to ſet aſide *all reveal'd Religion*: So that I may juſtly ſay of this Book, as the *Roman* Prætor *Petillius* did of That of the Laws of *Numa Pompilius*; which, like *This*, was dug out of Rubbiſh; that it was fitted only to *diſſolve* all Religion; or rather that *This forms* a Religion that is it ſelf fit to be *diſſolv'd*, and therefore ſhould *be burnt*, as That was by the Senate, rather than brought into the *Canon of the Scriptures*, which we are *ſure* are the *Word of God*. Liv. l. 40.

The Jeſuits in *China* have form'd a *new* Goſpel, repreſenting our *Saviour* only in his *moſt exalted* State, concealing his *Crucifixion*: On the other hand, you are depreſſing him into a *Creature*, not *concealing*, but *denying* his *Deity*. They might have learnt a better Leſſon from St. *Paul*, of glorying only in the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*; and St. *John* hath told *You*, that *he who denies the Son is Antichriſt*: *They* take away the *Means* of our Salvation, You take away the *Power*, by which he can *beſtow* and *give* it to us: They ſpeak *ſome* Truth, but not the *whole* Truth: You *deny the Truth*, which, St. *John* ſays, is no leſs than *making God a Liar*, *by not believing the Record which God gave of his Son*. Gal. vi. 14. 1 John ii. 22. 1 John v. 10.

F I N I S.

BOOKS Printed for Edward Valentine.

THE whole Works of Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*, containing thoſe Sermons printed in his Life-time, and all his Poſthumous ones, ſince publiſh'd by Dr. *Barker*, his Chaplain. In Three Volumes, *Folio.*

The Works of Sir *William Temple*, Bart. To which is prefix'd, Some Account of the Life and Writings of the Author. In Two Volumes, *Folio.*

A Paraphraſe and Comment upon the Epiſtles and Goſpels, appointed to be uſed in the Church of *England*, on all *Sundays* and Holidays throughout the Year. Deſigned to excite Devotion, and to promote the Knowledge and Practice of ſincere Piety and Virtue. By *George Stanhope*, D. D. Dean of *Canterbury*. In Four Volumes, 8*vo.*

The Conduct of Servants in great Families: Conſiſting of Diſſertations upon ſeveral Paſſages of the Holy Scriptures, relating to the Office of a Servant; with Ejaculations upon the Subject-Matter of each Diſcourſe. To theſe are annex'd, A Perſuaſive to a conſtant Attendance at the Devotions of the Family, and at the Holy Communion: And an earneſt Exhortation to refrain from Swearing, Curſing and Drunkenneſs. Each of which Subjects are diſtinctly treated in ſeveral Chapters. To which are added, Some Directions to regulate the Private Devotions of Servants; with Prayers and Hymns for that Purpoſe. The whole is compos'd for the Eſpecial Uſe of Noblemen's and Gentlemen's Servants. Very proper to be given away to Servants, 12*o.*

The Divinity of our Saviour proved, in an Eſſay on the Eternity of the Son of God.

Theſe Two by *Thomas Seaton*, M. A. Chaplain to the Right Honourable *Daniel* Earl of *Nottingham*, and Fellow of *Clare-Hall* in *Cambridge.*

Of the Law of Nature and Nations: In Eight Books. Written in *Latin* by Baron *Puffendorf*; done into *Engliſh*, by *Baſil Kennet*, D. D. The Third Edition, *Folio.*

The Omniſcience of the Son of God, an undoubted Argument of his Divinity: Being a Diſcourſe upon St. *Mark* xiii. 32. *I have yet many Things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot* bear *them now*, John xvi. 12.

Miſcel-

BOOKS Printed for Edward Valentine.

Miſcellaneous Diſcourſes relating to the Traditions of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* in *Jeſus Chriſt*'s Time. In Two Volumes, 8*vo*. Vol. I. Containing, 1. A Diſcourſe of the Nature, Authority, and Uſefulneſs of the *Miſna*. 2. A Table and Contents of all the Titles of the *Miſna*. 3. A Diſcourſe of the Recital of the *Shema*, Phylacteries, the Schedules of Gates and Door-Poſts. 4. Texts relating to the Religious Obſervation of One Day in Seven; with Notes. Vol. II. Containing Two *Miſnic* Titles, *Shabbath* and *Eruvin*, in *Hebrew* and *Engliſh*; with Notes. To which is prefix'd, A Letter from Mr. *Ockley*, Profeſſor of *Arabick* in *Cambridge*; occaſion'd by his Peruſal of this Work.

Letter to *Euſebia*, occaſioned by Mr. *Toland*'s Letters to *Serena*. Theſe Three by *W. Wotton*, D. D.

Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning: To which is added a Defence thereof, in Anſwer to the Objections of Sir *W. Temple*, and others: With Obſervations on the *Tale of a Tub*, by *W. Wooton*, D. D. As alſo a Diſſertation upon the Epiſtles of *Themiſtocles*, *Socrates*, and the Fables of *Æſop*. By *R. Bentley*, D. D. The Third Edition, 8*vo*.

An Account of *Denmark*. The Third Edition.

A ſhort Narrative of the Life of Count *Patkul*, a Nobleman of *Livonia*, who was broke alive upon the Wheel in *Great Poland*, 1707. Together with the Manner of his Execution. Written by the *Lutheran* Miniſter who aſſiſted him in his laſt Hours. Faithfully tranſlated out of a *High Dutch* Manuſcript, by *L. M.* The Second Edition. Price 1*s*.

All the Proceedings in relation to the *Ailsbury*-Men, committed by the Houſe of Commons; and the Report of the Lords Journal, and Reports of the Conferences, and of a Free Conference: Together with what ſtands upon the Journal of the Houſe of Commons, in the Reign of King *James* I. in the Caſe between Sir *Francis Goodwyn* and Sir *John Forteſcue*.

Aſhby and *White*; or, The Debates of the Houſe of Commons in *January*, 1704. concerning ſome Proceedings in Law, in relation to an Election at *Ailsbury*: Containing the Speeches of Mr. *Cowper*, (now Earl *Cowper*) Marquis of *Hartington*, (now Duke of *Devonſhire*) Mr. *Harley* (now Earl of *Oxford*) Mr. *Harcourt*, (now Lord *Harcourt*) Sir *Peter King*, (now Lord Chief-Juſtice of the *Common-Pleas*) Sir *Edward Seymour*, Sir *Chriſtopher Muſgrave*, Mr. *Dormer*, (now one of the Juſtices of the *Common-Pleas*) Sir *Gilb. Dolben*, Sir *H. Mackworth*, Sir *J. Jekyl*, (now Maſter of the *Rolls*) Sir *T. Powis*, Sir *T. Littleton*, Sir *J. Hawles*, Mr. *Lowndes*, Mr. *Freeman*, &c. on that Occaſion. In *Octavo*. Price 3*s*. 6*d*.

Gloſſographia Anglicana Nova; or, A Dictionary interpreting ſuch hard Words of whatever Language, as are at preſent us'd in the *Engliſh* Tongue; with their Etymologies, Definitions,

finitions, *&c.* Alſo the Terms of Divinity, Law, Phyſick, Mathematicks, Hiſtory, Agriculture, Logick, Metaphyſicks, Grammar, Poetry, Muſick, Heraldry, Architecture, Painting, War, and all other Arts and Sciences, are herein explain'd, from the beſt modern Authors; as, Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*,* Sir *William Temple*, Sir *Iſaac Newton*, Dr. *Harris*, Dr. *Gregory*, Mr. *Locke*, Mr. *Evelyn*, Mr. *Dryden*, Mr. *Blount*, &c. very uſeful to all thoſe that deſire to underſtand what they read.

A compleat Collection of State-Tryals, and Proceedings upon Impeachments for High-Treaſon, and other Crimes and Miſdemeanors, from the Reign of King *Henry* the Fourth to the End of the Reign of Queen *Anne*. In Four Volumes. With an exact Alphabetical Table to the whole.

Fables of *Æſop*, and other Eminent Mythologiſts; with Moral Reflections. By Sir *Roger L'Eſtrange*, Kt.

Lex Parliamentaria; or, A Treatiſe of the Law and Cuſtom of the Parliaments of *England*. By *G. P.* Eſq; With an *Appendix* of a Caſe in Parliament, between Sir *Francis Goodwyn* and Sir *John Forteſcue*, for the Knight's Place for the County of *Bucks*, 1 *Jac.* I.

Magnæ Britanniæ Notitia; or, The preſent State of *Great Britain*, with divers Remarks upon the Ancient and Preſent State thereof. By *John Chamberlain*, Eſq; Fellow of the Royal Society. The Five and Twentieth Edition of the *South* Part call'd *England*, and the Fourth of the *North* Part call'd *Scotland*: With Improvements; and more Exact and Larger Additions in the Liſt of the Officers, *&c.* than in any former Impreſſion. In Two Parts. With his Majeſty's Royal Privilege.

Politica Sacra & Civilis; or, A Model of Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Government: Wherein, beſides the Poſitive Doctrine concerning the State and Church in general, are debated the Principal Controverſies of the Times concerning the Conſtitution of the State and Church of *England*, tending to Righteouſneſs, Truth and Peace. By *George Lawſon*. The Second Edition.

An Account of *Sueden*, together with an Extract of the Hiſtory of that Kingdom. By a Perſon of Note, who reſided many Years there. The Third Edition. Price 1 *s.*

Memoirs of the moſt material Tranſactions in *England*, for the laſt Hundred Years preceding the Revolution in 1688. By *James Wellwood*, M. D. Fellow of the College of Phyſicians. The Sixth Edition. 12*o.* Price 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

Experiments and Obſervations upon *Oriental* and other *Bezoar* Stones, which prove them to be of no Uſe in Phyſick: *Gaſcoin*'s Powder diſtinctly examin'd. To which is annex'd, A Vindication of Sugars, againſt the Charge of Dr. *Willis*, *&c.* By *Frederick Slare*, M. D. Fellow of the College of Phyſicians, 8*vo.* Price 2 *s.*